The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1920 No. 2887

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 489
EDITORIALS:
The Soul of MacSwiney 491
The Farmers' Distress 492
Reaction and the Jew 493
What to do in Haiti 493
"Murdering Beauty" 494
The Paradox of Literature 495
THE END OF THE ENTENTE. By Robert Dell 496
TWILIGHT OF THE GODS. By Leonora Speyer 497
U. S. STEEL VS. MARGOLIS. By Swinburne Hale 498
THE FAILURE OF THE LEAGUE. By Otto H. Kahn 499
THE IRISH COMMITTEE CHOSEN 500
NATIONAL PLATFORM, SOCIALIST PARTY, 1920 502
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 503
CORRESPONDENCE 504
BOOKS:
Religion Psychologically Justified 506
Reparation 507
General Booth 507
Persian Literature 507
A Psychoanalyst of Poetry 508
Susan Glaspell 509
An Elder America 510
Books in Brief 511
ART: OUR NATIONAL PRINT ROOM 512
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
The Doctrine of the Natural Frontiers of France. By James Westfall Thompson 514

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER LEWIS S. GANNETT

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

IN a wholesale slanging match the campaign has ended. Had it lasted two weeks longer, the chief actors must all have been calling each other unvarnished liars. As it was, everybody seemed to be misquoting everybody else. Governor Cox failed, however, to draw a retraction from Ex-Senator Root, who denied after his only campaign speech, that he had misrepresented the Governor's position. But Mr. Root reversed himself in that speech as contrasted with a previous utterance, just as has every other politician in this campaign, the prize going to Mr. Taft, however, for boxing the League of Nations compass more times than anyone else, and cutting quite the most pitiful figure. To his joy, Governor Cox succeeded in fastening the fateful figure of 14 upon Senator Harding by proving easily that he has taken fourteen different positions on the League, and the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* printed, side by side on the same day, a statement by Mr. Taft that Harding would not scrap the League and one by Senator Johnson that the candidate would scrap the League. Mr. Harding, to the bitter end, reversed himself daily in his unsuccessful efforts to tell us where he really stands. So dissonant a chorus was surely never heard in a campaign before, and all about an issue in which the great public was not in the least degree interested. No stage army ever put up a more valiant or a more Falstaffian fight. Heaven preserve us from another like it, at least for four years to come! Let us hope that we have reached a period when we may breathe a little fresh air again, unhindered by transcendent political hypocrisies.

THE editor of the *New Republic* is profoundly distressed to discover that liberalism has undergone an eclipse since 1912 when the bulk of the Progressives turned to Wilson as their Moses. Mr. Croly attributes this eclipse chiefly "to the unreality which liberals have allowed to pervade liberalism." Close at hand is a much clearer and better reason. The temporary knell of American liberalism was sounded the minute its false leader put it into the war. This fact naturally does not appeal to the *New Republic,* because its editors have boasted that they helped to put the country into the struggle. Their quarrel with things as they are is that, having let loose the dogs of war, Mr. Wilson failed to confine the dogs' attention exclusively to the Germans and let them wreak havoc at home as well as abroad. But, bless us, whenever liberalism strikes hands with war it inevitably goes down. Cobden and Bright are the great figures they are in history because they denounced and fought against the Crimean war. Campbell-Bannerman bulks as large as he does because his British liberalism opposed the Boer war, formed no coalition government, and came gloriously back to power, to make retribution in South Africa. British liberalism is in complete eclipse today because, betrayed by Grey and Lloyd George, it struck hands with its political enemies and approved and fought the war. American liberalism is deservedly in eclipse today because it, too, went into the war. For war and liberalism to lie down together anywhere, at any time, with any excuse, means only one thing—disaster to liberalism. When war is declared on a foreign foe it is also declared on every forward-looking cause, every liberal, every reformer at home.

THE Allies seem to be showing a little more energy and determination in their treatment of Poland in the Vilna affair than they showed in the case of Italy and Fiume. Whatever the secret hopes of France may be, it has joined with Great Britain in a belated demand that Poland disavow the action of General Zellgouski in occupying Vilna and yield to the authority of the League of Nations. Poland's reply is characteristic of a nation that has successfully played the spoiled child so long that it has every reason to expect a complaisant acceptance of any excuses it may see fit to offer. The Franco-British protest it answers by an assertion that withdrawal from Vilna might result in "uprisings in the Polish army," by a plaintive hope that the Powers will not take advantage of Poland's difficulties by advocating such renunciation, and by a request that the Allies put no difficulties in the way of the reconstruction of Poland. A similar situation in Klagenfurt, where Jugoslav troops have occupied territory whose inhabitants had voted to remain with Austria, only brings up more sharply the one important question involved. What power has the League of Nations? Each incident is an armed challenge to the League to assert its authority in behalf of disinterested justice. The Jugoslav commanders at Klagenfurt have declared that they do not recognize the Allied plebiscite commission; Zellgouski

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has rejected a suggestion from Lithuania that negotiations be opened after the Polish troops have been withdrawn and the city turned over to the League of Nations commission. The future of the League depends largely on its ability to deal with these cases, and its ability depends wholly on the disinterested sincerity of France and Great Britain, and on their willingness to cooperate. It will be interesting to see how the League meets its first real test.

THE Franco-British rift grows, for it has its basis in a real conflict of interests. In the international game of freeze-out played at Versailles, Britain got the tangible assets, France the I. O. U.'s These France is now unable to convert, but that does not disturb Britain. Living Britishers will not need to fear Germany, stripped of navy, merchant marine, and colonies, as a commercial rival, while as a market for English goods, as a stabilizer of Balkanized central Europe, as a bulwark for the unknown that may come out of Russia, Germany appears a prudent object of British good-will and succor. In so far as it hastens the international healing process such a policy is desirable, but not at the expense of reparation to France. Misguided as has been French policy since the armistice, its Catonian attitude is based upon a very understandable fear. Apart from France's dire need of funds, and the obvious justice of forcing reparation for wanton destruction which in many cases served no military purpose but was a deliberate effort to delay French economic rehabilitation, the whole European situation fills the French with gloomy foreboding. If Germany can so soon flout her treaty obligations, they argue, is she not unchastened, merely biding her time to reassault a France, always smaller than she and soon, perhaps, isolated from her former Allies? It is this fear which has erected the fire-breathing chauvinist France of today, rattling her saber from Rhine to Vistula and increasing thereby the very peril that she fears. Her premise is sound: Germany should pay all that she possibly can; reparation is one of the first and most fundamental steps toward peace, stability, and good-will. But Germany can pay only with the fullest cooperation of the outside world, only if she receives raw materials, the use of ships and credit. England has all of these; hers is the duty and opportunity to enable Germany to meet the obligation to France. A declaration of such a purpose would go far to revive the fast vanishing Entente.

THE fifty-seven Oxford professors who have proposed a resumption of amicable relations with German and Austrian scholars voice sentiments that must warm the heart of every generous and fair-minded person, no matter what his political or national affiliations. "In the field where our aims are one, our enthusiasm the same, our rivalry and ambition generous," so runs the letter from Oxford, "we can surely look to be reconciled, and the fellowship of learning offers a road which may—and if our spiritual ideals be alive must—lead to wider sympathy and better understanding between our kindred nations." It cannot be said too often that the most pitiful and sordid and unnecessary adjunct of war is the shunning of any science or literature or music because it belongs to an enemy. The things by which men live—certain economic and political considerations—may with some amount of logic be said to appertain to a certain race or group, though nations are steadily if very slowly blundering on toward complete internationalism. But about the arts and sciences, which are the things by which men live well, there should never be any question. They belong, not to France or England or Germany, but to the world. And the world has been deprived long enough of the contribution which Germany and Austria have made in the past and may make in the future. As for the Oxford professors, it ought to be a cause for pride in every Englishman that they have led the way toward that spiritual intercourse which should never have been interrupted. When will our professorate follow suit?

THE throne of Greece is on the bargain-counter once more, but it matters little who makes the highest bid and wins the name of king; Venizelos is king-maker and dictator, the most powerful potentate in Europe today. When Constantine was engineered off the throne in 1917, Venizelos passed over the Crown Prince and made the 23-year-old Prince Alexander king; and whether Alexander's younger brother or a western prince succeeds him, Venizelos will continue to be the real power. Even should Greece become a republic in name, Venizelos's dictatorship would in fact continue. It is reported that there is a powerful group in Greece seeking the return of the ex-King Constantine; but after-war restlessness, discontent with economic conditions which have only been aggravated by the extension of frontiers and military expeditions into Asia Minor, and revolt against the iron hand and iron will of Venizelos will certainly have more to do with any such movement than personal popularity of the ex-king. A king in exile acquires a certain romantic charm which a king powerless in the palace is sure to lack. Both the glamor of dynasties and the frenzy of national pride fade in the face of pressing daily difficulties.

TO the average layman unversed in legal technicalities the verdict of United States District Judge Knox of New York affirming the deportability of communists appears less valid than the contrary decision rendered last June by Federal Judge Anderson of Boston. In both instances mere membership in the party alleged to advocate "overthrow of the Government by force or violence" was chiefly at issue. Judge Anderson held that "the only force . . . . advocated by the party is the general strike." Now, contrary to the widely prevailing impression, a strike —even a general strike—is not violence. Indeed the organized cessation of work—the negation of activity—has come to be generally accepted in America as the workers' legitimate means of securing redress for grievances when all other methods of adjustment fail. Strikes may lead to violence, but the history of labor disputes in which it has occurred shows that the blame lies in no small proportion of cases with the employing side. However strongly one may disapprove or deprecate the general strike with its inevitable harvest of suffering and its undeniable reproach to the civilization which now permits it, the strike per se is no more violence than the shutdown of mills by an employer is violence. But Judge Knox asserts:

> if force and violence be not within the contemplation of the party it would be a simple matter to have the absence of such thought clearly appear. As it is, the language used would seem designed to mean all things to all men and to be fairly suscepti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble of meaning, even though it does not unequivocally declare in favor of force and violence.

Curiously this characterization also applies to the Republican and Democratic platforms; and one may well wonder at the validity of a decision which while admitting the absence of the proscribed verbiage finds in the failure to call attention to such absence a confession of guilt. What then becomes of the traditional "presumption of innocence"? An interpretation admittedly so unrelated to the facts recalls the error of our Federalist judges of more than a century ago who convicted of *intent*, if in their opinion *tendency* to incite disaffection was found.

ORGANIZED labor can only benefit by the thorough exposure of the scandal in the building trade in New York, for organized labor has suffered too long from the flag-waving and super-patriotic yet grafting type of labor leader. There has been no labor group in New York more solidly hostile to innovation, more bitterly anti-Socialist, anti-bolshevist, pro-Gompers, and pro-Tammany than the very men who have now been discovered in cahoots with their own employers, calling strikes and calling off strikes for blackmail, robbing their own workers as well as the public. Mr. Samuel Untermyer, counsel for the Lockwood investigating committee, and the New York *World*, which made the preliminary investigation, are to be congratulated upon their service to the public. Mr. Palmer's agents had investigated the alleged building combine before, but without result; now Mr. Untermyer uncovers an amazing card index system which has effectively eliminated competitive bidding among building contractors, kept prices artificially high, and seriously discouraged building; and he finds leaders of organized labor working hand in hand with these contractors, sharing the profits of conscienceless profiteering. The investigation cannot go too far; such housecleaning is a healthy thing; it will do labor good.

NEWSPAPER editors are showing small appreciation of the significance of the deportation order issued by the British authorities against Mr. E. J. Costello, managing editor of the Federated Press, and the seizure of his papers in London. Mr. Costello was accused of no crime, nor even of propaganda; he had not been to Russia, which seems to have replaced murder as a punishable offense in these gallant days; he had merely conferred, in a neutral country, with Russians, regarding American rights to the service of a Russian news agency with which, it is reliably reported, the Associated Press was also bargaining, and he had strengthened the connection between the Federated Press and the London *Herald*, the daily organ of the British Labor Party, with a circulation of more than 350,000. Mr. Costello represented a chain of labor papers; but if labor editors can be dealt with in such summary and high-handed fashion, other editors can too; and in these days no editor whose paper has any editorial policy whatever can be sure that he or his correspondents will not find themselves in possession of evidence which the authorities do not care to see printed. The action is a flagrant violation of the most elementary freedom of the press; and the refusal of our State Department to protest is in accord with Mr. Colby's policy of secrecy and manipulating of news. The evil heritage of the war is still with us; and the worst of it is that we have become too dulled to resent the robbing of our liberties.

The Soul of MacSwiney

"Terence MacSwiney dies in Brixton prison on the seventy-fourth day of his fast."—News Item.

Thou wilt be dead tomorrow.—Nay, tomorrow
The land will be awake. What recks it then
Who will be dead, or I or anyone
Amongst us who must fall? The land will live.

'Twere sweet to sink in Death for Truth and Freedom!
Yes, who could hesitate, for who could bear
The living degradation we must know
If we do dread death for a sacred cause?

THESE are the words of the martyr himself. While yet a boy Terence MacSwiney penned them and, rare mortal that he was, lived up in maturity to the sentiments he professed in immaturity. He has sunk in Death for Truth and Freedom, but his soul, too, now goes marching on. With marvelous fortitude and superhuman endurance, he has lived an incredible seventy-four days, suffering tortures beyond purgatory, giving his life for his country more truly, more nobly, with rarer devotion than any soldier that ever wore His Majesty's uniform. For there is no blood guilt upon him; no stain upon his hands. Once more passive resistance, most deadly of weapons, has triumphed. Once more the whole world is quickened and inspired and glorified, by the example of one who placed his cause above his existence, yea, above the happiness of life with wife and child, which could have been his had he yielded but one inch. From Frongoch Prison he wrote in July, 1916: "Indeed, in all truth I feel that when my body is laid to rest at night my spirit for the time, not charged with its keeping, must often take a flight over the fair hills of holy Ireland." And over the fair hills of holy Ireland will his spirit keep watch for time eternal.

Selfish some may call him; plain suicide others; madman he will be termed by those who sit in palaces, in the seats of the mighty—but who today is more certain of immortality? He will live on by the side of Robert Emmet, in ballad, in epic, in saga, in the hearts of generations yet unborn, who will need to know nothing more than that his soul triumphed over the flesh that a free, independent, and happy Ireland might at last come to pass. "His eyes," writes one who knows him well, "seemed fixed on the distance of his dreams . . . an expression of spiritual brooding and trouble seemed native there. The lips were gentle and sensitive—he often smiled, though not for long. The voice was low and pleading, its more urbane quality kept for 'foreign' subjects. The black hair was a revolutionary mass."

And Ireland? When John Brown died, Wendell Phillips said: "Men walked Boston streets when night fell on Bunker's Hill, and pitied Warren, saying, 'Foolish man! Thrown away his life! Why didn't he measure his means better?' Now we see him standing colossal on that blood-stained sod, and severing that day the tie which bound Boston to Great Britain. That night George III ceased to rule in New England. History will date Virginia emancipation from Harper's Ferry." The roots of British government in Ireland are loosened. May not some future Wendell Phillips say of that government that it only breathed and did not live in Ireland from the hour that Terence MacSwiney's soul sped on its way?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Farmers' Distress

"THERE is a revolution on among the farmers of this country," writes one of the best-posted Washington correspondents. He then describes the excitement of the delegations of farmers now reaching Washington in order to beseech the Federal Reserve Board for aid. They are not a bit interested in whether Cox or Harding is to be elected; they have forgotten what they ever knew about the League of Nations; they are concerned only whether they are to be ruined by the drop in prices. A traveling salesman who has just traversed Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska reports a veritable panic in the smaller towns. The banks are being compelled by the bigger city banks and the Federal Reserve Board to call in loans, and the farmers, being unable to sell their crops at anything save a heavy loss, are in despair, and cannot pay their loans. In some regions they have been unable to market their crops because the elevators were still full of 1919 wheat and cars were almost impossible to obtain. In other sections the fault is squarely the farmer's; he has been holding back his crop in the hope of three-dollar wheat, and the deserved fate of the would-be profiteer is his. But whether he is or is not at fault, the truth is that the farmer is in a blue funk. The weekly news-letter of the Department of Agriculture for October 20 declares that comparatively few farmers have been making large profits during the recent years of high prices. While the average return on their investment increased only from four per cent in 1913 to seven per cent in 1918, most of them are still making less than $500 cash over and above the products of the farm used by the family for its living. They have no margin of safety for so grave a crisis as this.

Now what is true of the farmers is also true in considerable degree of the cotton planters and cattle raisers. To save the cotton situation in the South where the familiar Southern lawlessness has begun to show itself in Ku-Klux riding, cotton-gin burning, threats of personal violence, etc., the Southern bankers at the meeting of the American Bankers' Association in Washington last week agreed upon the formation of a twelve million dollar corporation to aid in exporting cotton, particularly to those countries like Germany, which cannot pay spot cash for cotton. This shows a commendable spirit of self-help, but it still leaves a doubt as to many things which the public would like to have explained. Why, it asks, should there be a credit famine and such high rates of interest when we are told by the Comptroller of the Currency that the banking resources of the United States amount to $53,079,108,000; that these resources "break all records anywhere, exceeding the combined bank assets of all other leading nations of the world." We know that America is the credit reservoir of the globe; we have more than one-third of all the gold in the world, and we have ten times the credit resources we had twenty years ago. Yet, besides the cotton situation and the wheat crisis, there is no credit for the wool grower or for the cattle man. The value of our farm products is not far from $24,000,000,000 a year, and it is upon these products that most of us live. Yet the producers allege that they are being sabotaged by the banks which will not give them credit with which to hold their produce until they can realize a price at least sufficient to cover the cost of production.

So the public is beginning to ask the banking world if it is true that the banking resources are largely "frozen in speculation." It grants that there are certain specific causes of trouble beyond the control of the banks, as for instance the export trade. But for two years past every conceivable commodity has been speculated in at home by brokers, commission merchants, and bankers, and these speculators have been aided by the banks of our great cities in the process of hoarding for further rises. More than a billion dollars, according to the Comptroller of the Currency, was being loaned on Wall Street as call money at the very moment when the farmers of the West were vainly seeking funds with which to move their produce. Billions of dollars have been taken from useful pursuits, such as the building of homes and the handling of crops in order to maintain this speculative structure now endangered by the break in prices, due, among other causes, to the boycott of the buying public. The bank loans which are at the bottom of this speculation cannot today be called even though orders to this effect come from on high; the interests of borrowers and those who loan are too closely intertwined. The banks themselves might go down if they forced a liquidation on a declining market. In consequence, the credit resources of this country seem tied up in what appears for the moment an untieable knot. In addition, the country is wasting its enormous resources for army and navy and expenditures due to the present and previous wars—ninety-three per cent of our huge expenditure going for these purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30th last. We are daily lending more money to Europe; the recent French loan aggregated $800,000,000 and it was subscribed while our Western farmers were in great distress.

The Federal Reserve banking system is the one achievement upon which all Democrats pride themselves. They dare not disclose any weaknesses thereof, and the Republican Party is too closely identified with the banking interests to grapple vigorously with the banking problem. So the public for the present is asking what has happened to the record-breaking credit resources of this country: Are they being used for speculation when they are needed for production, and is an undue proportion being loaned abroad? Or is the prevailing phenomenon merely due to the decrease of inflation and the necessary checking of over-expansion? Are our farmers merely paying the price of the stringent readjustment, such as has fallen to the lot of the silk manufacturers, who are down practically to pre-war prices, and the leather producers, who are actually back to the 1914 rates?

We shall all probably have to pay a price for the wicked waste and extravagance of the war, and perhaps those are to be congratulated who are having their reaction now. But none the less, the plight of our producers of the great crops is such that we are persuaded the new Congress will have to inquire into the situation at once and to establish the truth with genuine zeal if the revolutionary farmer outbursts at Washington are not to become of grave political significance and, for instance, make the Nonpartisan League the dominating political factor in the West. The progressive element in the new Congress can do no greater service than to take up this economic issue which the two major party candidates have studiously ignored.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reaction and the Jew

A WAVE of anti-Semitism is once more sweeping the world. The Poles in their nationalistic frenzy are trying to exterminate the three million Jews within their boundaries; the Pan-Germans in the festering powerlessness of their defeat are furbishing the old weapons of reaction; a virulent British pamphlet, "The Jewish Peril," has been insinuatingly presented in what passes for the mind of Henry Ford, his paper, the Dearborn *Independent*, which has diluted it in a series of articles; open letters of an anti-Semitic tinge are beginning to appear in our conservative press; public anti-Jewish meetings have been held in the streets of Brooklyn, and clergymen of the hectic and sensational type are at their old game of finding an Anti-Christ, and are loudly identifying the godless Bolshevik with the Jew.

The chief responsibility for the revival of this hoary shame among us in America attaches to Henry Ford. His name, like his car, reaches the common man who reasons that the multimillionaire mechanic cannot be wholly wrong. Yet it is this latest exploit that, once and for all, confirms and stamps the ethical and intellectual character of the Detroit manufacturer. He pretended to be a pacifist; he fitted out and set sail in a "peace ship." Today he betrays the very spirit of peace and flings another torch into an already blazing world. For beneath every accidental and temporary cause of human discord lurks the most lasting and malignant of all—the blind and bloody hatred of tribe for tribe, race for race, the denial of that universal and purely human solidarity which is the one ultimate hope of peace and civilization among men. Whoever stirs up these ancient and barbarous hatreds of race or creed or color, whoever sets Gentile against Jew, white against black, the races of the West against those of the East, approaches mankind with the kiss of the betrayer and the dagger of the assassin. There can be no compromise, no shadow of wavering on this supreme issue. We are imprisoned upon this little earth; the universal forces are careless of our welfare; earthquakes and storms tumble down our frail shelters and disease gnaws at our perishable bodies. How shall we fight our way out of the darkness if not as brothers? How shall we build a humane civilization if, in the maze of ghastly figments and cruel superstitions, we persecute and wound and darken each other's souls?

The common source of Mr. Ford's propaganda, of the pamphlet "The Jewish Peril," and of "The Cause of World Unrest," published with sinister anonymity by G. P. Putnam's Sons, is an old and absurd forgery that is sufficiently and, we hope, finally exposed by Mr. Lucien Wolf in the London *Spectator*. At every great revolution in human affairs since the days of the Protestant Reformation, this fable of a world-wide Jewish conspiracy against the safety of civilization and the vested interests of the age has been an easy weapon in the hands of the reactionaries. The Puritan Revolution in England was attributed to "Quakers, freethinkers, and godless Jews," and numerous French writers from 1797 to 1883 sought to father the French Revolution itself on Masonic and Jewish conspiracies. The old forgery known as "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" was revamped by a Prussian postal clerk who was himself discharged from the service for forgery in 1868. But a Russian edition of his work, attributed to a "Professor Sergyei Nilus," was used as a pogrom weapon during the Russian Revolution of 1905 and a French version of the latter was published in 1911. It is the work of this entirely mythical Nilus which forms the immediate basis for "The Jewish Peril," the articles in Mr. Ford's paper, and the more recent "The Cause of World Unrest."

The motive for the emergence of these old forgeries and slanders at this moment in history is clear enough. The industrial revolution of today is attributed to Jewish conspirators precisely as was the Puritan Revolution in England, the French Revolution, and the Russian Revolution of 1905. The technique of reaction, whether economic or political, has not changed with the ages. Its essence has always been to divert the attention of the masses from real to fancied dangers, and to blind them to their true interests by playing upon their superstitious fears and their tribal prejudices. The Czars veiled their iniquities by staging pogroms; the Polish imperialists seek to stifle the consciousness of typhus, hunger, and needless warfare by setting the people against their Jewish compatriots; international finance having sown the wind and reaped the whirlwind, finds it easy and useful to point to Eisner, Trotzky, and even to Morris Hillquit, not as to thinkers and revolutionaries, but as to members of a conspiracy undertaken by an alien, dangerous, and mysterious folk.

What to do in Haiti

AFFAIRS in Haiti and Santo Domingo have at last been brought publicly to the attention of the American people; the question now is, what is the American people going to do about it? It is not enough to send half a dozen admirals and major generals investigating, with the inevitable result of more or less white-washing reports. The important question is, what shall be American policy toward these Carribbean republics whose independence we have taken from them and whose government is now in the hands of the United States Marine Corps?

Investigation there must be, and consequent punishment, but the investigation should be made by Congress and not by interested parties, and the punishment must not be confined to isolated cases of boys who, taking from their superiors the current attitude of contempt for the natives, were guilty of excesses such as have in all time characterized all armies of occupation lording it over a suppressed people. Nor should penalties stop even with a few brutal lieutenants with possibly a captain or two or a major to give an appearance of thorough expiation. The fundamental atrocity of American rule in Haiti and Santo Domingo is the very fact of unwarranted military interference, rather than the shooting of unarmed prisoners or brutal torture. It will take a broad-minded committee of the ablest men in Congress—men without color prejudice—to study the question in its largest aspects. There must be no such hasty generalizations as characterized that bold Congressional committee which reported on conditions in the Virgin Islands after spending thirty hours there! If such a committee is not appointed by Congress in its coming session the Republicans will convict themselves of having exploited the agony of a subject people merely for campaign material.

Haitians have indeed rejoiced that their case has at last come before the American people and the world. *The Nation*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is proud of its share in bringing this about. But publicity is of value to the Haitians only as a first step toward their independence which it is now America's solemn duty to guarantee effectively and for all time as a pledge of our good faith and as partial atonement for our dastardly assault upon it. The United States must retire from Haiti at the earliest possible moment. Meanwhile it is our clear duty to repair the damage done, to indemnify the innocent victims of wanton brutality, to aid in restoring the government we have demolished and to reestablish the economic and financial structure of the country. While never solid, the economic status of Haiti has in no wise been strengthened and in many respects it has been weakened by the exploiting interests which have sought to entrench themselves under cover of our occupation. Our first step should be the withdrawal of our military and naval forces. It is a question, of course, whether such withdrawal can be made suddenly. The curse of military rule, as has been shown all over the world, is that it leaves anarchy and upheaval in its wake. If the United States withdraws its troops suddenly from a country whose self-governing functions have been atrophied for five years and whose people have been made resentful by cruel oppression, grave disorders might conceivably follow. In fact there are ugly rumors that those desirous of maintaining our illegitimate hold upon Haiti permanently, plan some such course in order to justify prompt reoccupation. But no such consideration should for a moment obscure the necessity of declaring in unmistakable terms our purpose of withdrawing within a definite and comparatively short period of time—three to five years at the utmost—and of utilizing the interval for intelligent reconstruction. We did it in Cuba; we can do it again. It should be our pride to do so.

The task of reestablishing civil government should be entrusted to joint commissions of Americans and Haitians or Dominicans; and after the years in which we have sent "deserving Democrats" and parish politicians to the unhappy island, the naming of the American members would give opportunity to restore our reputation in Latin-America. There should be both white and colored Americans among them. Such a joint commission could proceed to the task of holding local or municipal elections, then provincial, where such are in order, and finally to the election of new national assemblies which could replace the caprice of martial law and "executive order" with republican administration. Meanwhile the commission, calling on the best talent available, should make a thorough survey of Haiti's resources and potentialities, and base the reconstruction program on facts, scientifically established by competent and careful experts.

There is more than this. The Haitian-American treaty, forced on an unwilling Haitian Assembly, must be denounced; the new Constitution, passed under the aegis of American military rule, with its special provisions designed to facilitate American business, should give way to the old rule of Haiti for the Haitians. We have killed one in every four hundred Haitians, two hundred and fifty Haitians to every American killed, and that such ratios are not those of decent warfare. We owe Haiti more than to get out; we owe positive amends for the past. It is not easy for a proud people to confess that it has erred; but the facts in this case are so flagrant and so sure that not otherwise can a proud honor be satisfied.

"Murdering Beauty"

AT the Butirki prison in Moscow, say certain Frenchmen who were formerly there as involuntary guests of the Bolsheviki, there is a beautiful Lettish girl, at about the remorseless age of fifteen, who acts as official executioner, shooting her victims expertly in the back when they have been chosen by lot and led before her. The brawny Jack Ketch of the old tradition has yielded to a mere "flapper," "with unerring aim and a lust for blood."

The French will be French! Our minds go back to some thousands of fine poems and of gallant speeches which have been made by this fine and gallant race upon the theme of "murdering beauty." What after all is so deadly as a lovely eye? It stabs deep with a glint, slays with a glance, and utterly consumes with a level gaze. There is no armor proof against it. Whenever beauty walks abroad it leaves its path strewn with the wrecks of foolish men who have encountered it. It rises in the morning, like the sun for glory, and kills off a few swains who are outside its casement when first it looks out at the new day. It lisps its dutiful orisons, tastes matutinal nectar, and comes forth to begin its proper business. Walking beside some clear brook it topples one venturer after another into the sympathetic flood. On the smooth enameled green, where daisies pie the meadow, beauty does its fatal work no less ruthlessly than in secluded arbors or umbrageous grottoes. Then mounted on its favorite courser it takes to the hunt, leaving to others the lighter task of bringing down the boar or catching up with the fox, but itself more deadly among the human quarry who, though hunters, are at last the hunted. Finally twilight, the end of the day, candles, spinet and dulcimer and the soft recorders, witching sounds, and more bewitching silences; but still beauty goes on its conquering course. Not even midnight dims it. When beauty has retired from mortal sight, the lover who had not the luck to come within its range and so be slaughtered, lies disconsolate upon his couch waiting for another day and another chance to dare the killing eyes of beauty.

The French will be French! Even in the dungeon, say the old gallants, they longed for the most murderous gleam of beauty. Better that and annihilation than the long night of safety. Leaning out of his desperate window this or that prisoner, if he beheld some lady walking in the courtyard, would fix his admiration upon her and bend every effort to draw in his direction that killing look. Is there not a story by Kenneth Graham about a headswoman in some Ruritanian region who became so popular that the whole world masculine swarmed to her begging to be slain as a tender personal favor? And did they not swarm so numerously that it embarrassed the land and almost stripped it of its finest heroes because they chose death by the delicate headswoman rather than life at any less exquisite hands whatever?

We do not know whether it was in this fashion that the prisoners of the Bolsheviki behaved, but we suspect that something of the sort might have happened, so true to form does their ancient gallantry seem to have run. It might have happened; it must have happened. For this is not, after all, history we are talking about. It is romance, the latest child of propaganda—romance joyfully conscripted in the war against the enemies of the old order and naturally using the old, old tricks.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Paradox of Literature

WHEN his dark hours are upon him the man of letters will often envy the practitioners of other arts. Their medium is so fresh and plastic, his own so stained and rigid. Theirs is free and self-existent, his is entangled in all the base uses of the world. He listens to the third Etude of Chopin, to the Andante of Beethoven's twenty-third sonata, and he despairs. Such divine freedom and purity of utterance is not for him. The dust of all trodden ways blows on his lips; the sound of all harsh and meaningless voices is in his ears. There are glossy shadows on the broad, bright stream; a shiver runs rustling through the innumerable leaves of a tree. So long as he contemplates these objects—identifies himself with them or absorbs them into himself—he is safe. The moment he speaks his agony begins. For the names he uses are the names neither of these things nor of his vision of them, but of a thousand blunted perceptions and half-obliterated memories. He cannot, like the musician, invent an expression never heard before. He must take the shabby old names of things and, by a trickery that threatens always to make an artifice of his art, seek to lend them some freshness and immediacy and sting. And even while he labors thus, he loses bit by bit the uniqueness of his relation to the things contemplated, which alone made his moment worth recording.

He is in far worse case when he comes to deal with the operations of the mind and, above all, when he deals with moral qualities and moral facts. The names by which these go are of a Byzantine conventionalism—remote and bloodless and inflexible. He may mean to bless and succeed in cursing. For his words bristle with alien angers and false judgments and with all the moral rancor of the dead. Let him speak of a noble selfishness, and he will be accused of vain singularity; or of a spiritual use of sensual experience, and he will be held to blaspheme. For these words have so lost touch with the facts of life, and have become so merged in a militant conceptualism, that men no longer use them to name things, but rather do violence to all things in order to crush them into what is considered the appropriate mould. But since men are willing to suffer hunger and disease, to fight and to die for mere names, it is clear that the artist in literature will often himself be snared by words. So that, in order to speak beautifully and truly, he must struggle not only against the dead weight of nearly all his fellows, but often against the confusions of his own mind. Let him love liberty and praise it, some one will discover that he has counseled license. The ugly word may startle him and even keep him from seeing that no such thing exists, but that it is a name men use for stigmatizing the liberties which they themselves do not want to exercise.

It is, when one reflects, as though from the beginning man had been haunted by a great fear, and in that fear had sought deliberately to darken and to simplify the beautiful and various world as well as his own subtle and divided heart. Thus he took all sharp perceptions and unborrowed passions and far-ranging thoughts, and gave to these infinitely multiform things a few quite bleak and rigid names. And the power of these names in keeping out freedom and fear was such that he came to believe that they exhausted the varieties of his experience, and grew angry if anyone offered to extend his narrow world a little farther toward the wide boundaries of reality. The proof of this unconscious process is marvelously revealed when one compares different languages and the people who speak them. There are languages that contain names for moods and for moral perceptions and distinctions, as well as for qualities in the external world, that are blankly absent from our own. Are we then incapable of these moods and perceptions? No; for we acquire them when we perfectly acquire that other tongue. But so long as we are confined to one language we are imprisoned within the moral twists and self-imposed limitations of those dead speakers of it who checked the growth of certain moods and perceptions and distinctions by giving them either deprecating names or the names of other things. Thus men have named things out of existence, and actually impoverished human life by forcing upon delicate and subtle phenomena both of the world and of the mind the harsh names of what all knew and approved. This universal nominalism is far more dangerous than is commonly thought; it can drain life and kill things and cripple the soul.

This, then, is the paradox of literature. The artist desires to reveal and interpret reality. But he must use a medium built from the beginning to darken and conceal it. Not until he is himself liberated from the medium of his art can he begin to practice it truly; not until he has died to all words can the world be born again in his own soul. He must return to the eternally concrete and name no thing until he has grasped it in its real nature, nor compare it to another until he has known it to be essentially incomparable. To know human thoughts and actions he must have learned to see them as unique and without name; he must recover a complete innocence of vision and let no words betray him into violating it. And when he has done all that and has at last made himself worthy of his art—then comes his hardest hour. He cannot, after all, invent new symbols; he is bound to the use of speech. Now that he knows the full treachery of words, he must use them to reveal that very treachery and to lead men back to all the things these words have stunted or defamed or left unspoken. He has substituted realities for myths in his own mind, but myths are all he has with which to body forth realities in art. He shifts the meaning of a symbol here and alters a connotation there. For all that, he has the foreknowledge of ultimate failure. All that he says will still hide his direct vision of reality and leave his agonies and exaltations blurred and dim.

Yet his career of failure is not without its luminous moments. His aim is so high that a fleeting success reconciles him to his fate. For such success is, in the truest sense, creative. It gives men not only beauty but vision, not only delight but life. It increases the number of living realities, extends the possibilities of experience, and creates both things and thoughts that would else be lost to the consciousness of man. This is what the ten thousand scribblers do not understand. They heap words upon words and tribal formularies on tribal formularies. The true artist in letters gives life and creates freedom. In the paradox of literature he finds both his pain and his reward. His success is difficult and rare. But, when it comes, it breaks the fetters of the world and adds to the sum of our unalterable good.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The End of the Entente

By ROBERT DELL

London, Oct. 8

TO understand the French and British foreign policies of today and their increasing divergence, which has led to the practical dissolution of the Entente Cordiale, one must go back to the Peace Conference. It is the general belief in England that M. Clemenceau had it all his own way at the Conference, but that is not the fact, although, as Mr. Maynard Keynes has said: "So far as the main economic lines of the Treaty represent an intellectual idea, it is the idea of France and Clemenceau." Lloyd George has encouraged this belief for his own purposes. Now that the Treaty of Versailles is becoming more and more unpopular in England, and its impossibilities and disastrous results more and more generally recognized, it suits Lloyd George to represent himself as an innocent victim, who has no responsibility for what is worst in the Treaty. Perhaps one of Lloyd George's most useful qualities is his remarkable power of detachment. During the general election campaign of 1918, he asked an astonished company in a private house after dinner whether they did not agree with him that the "stunt" about hanging the Kaiser that "those people" were running was very absurd. Although it got him his majority, he is quite capable of saying during the next general election campaign that that "stunt" never had his approval. He always manages to lay the blame for everything that goes wrong on one or more of his colleagues while he, personally, takes the credit for everything that goes right. He never commits himself definitely to any policy; somehow or other he manages to leave himself a way of escape, so that he can turn out to have been right in any event. I shall never forget the speech in the House of Commons about a year ago when, with Winston Churchill writhing in agony on the bench beside him, he calmly repeated and made his own all the arguments against intervention in Russia, informed the House that he had always said that it would be a failure, and took credit for deep foresight. Not one of his followers rose and asked him why he had spent an hundred million pounds on an enterprise that he knew to be futile. Lloyd George has acquired a reputation for statesmanship by the simple method of frankly declaring, when his policy has proved a failure, that he always knew it would fail. Nine out of ten Englishmen know him to be a charlatan and a trickster, but they flatter themselves that he cannot humbug them, and believe that his wiles are as useful to the country as to himself. It is a fond illusion.

Had Mr. Lloyd George gone to Paris with the intention of making a peace on the basis of the Fourteen Points and backing Mr. Wilson, he and Mr. Wilson could have done what they liked. But he was handicapped in the first place by his own election pledges about hanging the Kaiser and making Germany pay for the war; and hampered in the second place by the necessity of satisfying the appetites of the group of capitalists that surround him and upon whom he is dependent for election and propaganda funds, since he has no political organization behind him. He soon got on the weak side both of Wilson and of Clemenceau. Mr. Keynes has given an amusing description of the successful humbugging of poor Mr. Wilson, who seems to have been an easy victim. Clemenceau was a more difficult nut to crack, but Lloyd George cracked it. Clemenceau had one idea: the political and economic destruction of Germany. On that point he was intractable. It was useless to point out to him that the economic restoration of Germany was a necessary condition of an indemnity to France. He preferred to go without an indemnity rather than allow Germany to recover. Lloyd George saw at once how this crazy fanaticism could be exploited. He gave M. Clemenceau his "Carthaginian Peace," well knowing that it would land France in such insoluble difficulties that she would sooner or later be obliged to make concessions, and fully intending to get round it on the first opportunity. And, having thus squared Clemenceau, he carried off all the material advantages. This was made the easier by Clemenceau's ignorance of and indifference to economic questions, which led him gaily to surrender even the oil of Mosul, which had been secured to France by a secret agreement during the war. Thus Lloyd George satisfied his capitalist friends; got rid of the German navy and mercantile marine; secured the greater part of the German colonies; and in fact carried off the substance while Clemenceau gloated over the shadow. France got Alsace-Lorraine and an indemnity that Germany, as Lloyd George well knew, could never pay.

It was not long before the French people began to realize the true state of affairs. Of course the French people had themselves to blame, for they should never have thrown themselves into the arms of Clemenceau. The grotesque adulation of that old gentleman illustrated a weakness of the French character, which is always looking for traitors on the one hand and saviors on the other. One of the results of the discovery that Clemenceau had been humbugged was a wave of Anglophobia accompanied by the revival of the ridiculous legend that Clemenceau was an English agent. The Anglophobia has now become almost as violent and quite as silly as in the days of the Fashoda trouble and the feeling against America is only less bitter, although Mr. Wilson won unexpected praise by his support of French policy in Poland. One of the chief grievances against the English and the Americans is the depreciation of the franc, which is attributed to deliberate and Machiavellian intrigues on their part. Another quite legitimate grievance against England is the high export price of English coal, which enables it to be sold to the home consumer below its market value. This exploitation of our late Allies, from which Italy suffers still more than France, is disgraceful. Unfortunately, instead of recognizing that their discomfiture at the Peace Conference was due to a deficient sense of the realities and acting accordingly, the French are now seeking to satisfy their *amour-propre* by an ambitious foreign policy aiming at the political hegemony of Europe. And they are still trying to make German economic restoration impossible, although the economic restoration of Continental Europe as a whole, including France herself, depends upon it. It must be said that the French people are still terrified of Germany. They have been persuaded by the governmental press that Germany is still an imminent danger and that France will never be safe until Germany is dismembered and politically annihilated. This feeling is intensified

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the fact that the guaranties given to France by the Peace treaties have disappeared. The alliance with America and England has fallen through—happily for America and England—and the League of Nations is an impotent sham. The French forget that the latter fact is the fault of their own Government more than any other, for it is the French Government that obstinately opposes the admission of the late enemy countries into the League, without which it can never be of any value.

All these causes have led to the present restless and mischievous activity of French foreign policy. It is trying to separate Bavaria from Germany and unite it to Austria under a Wittelsbach sovereign. It is trying to restore the monarchy in Hungary and perhaps also to link it up with Austria and Bavaria. It is trying to use Poland as a catspaw against Communist Russia. It wants to set up a number of reactionary states under French influence to be used as buffers against Germany on the one hand and Russia on the other, failing the restoration of Czarism in the latter country, which is the aim of the French protégé, Wrangel, one of whose generals is well known as a relative of the late Czar. The secret treaty with Belgium, which the French and Belgian Governments have refused to communicate to the League of Nations in defiance of the terms of the Covenant of the League, probably has as its ulterior object the separation from Germany of the territory on the left bank of the Rhine now occupied by the Allied forces, and its establishment as a vassal state. Outside Europe there is the senseless Syrian expedition which will bring France nothing but expensive glory.

This policy is likely to be disastrous to France. One of its consequences is an increase of four billion francs in the army estimates for the coming year. At least the same amount has been diverted from the sums voted by Parliament for the restoration of the devastated region to be spent on equipping the Polish army and that of Wrangel. The country is rushing headlong on the road to ruin. The policy is equally disastrous to Europe. Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, and Rumania have already formed a defensive alliance against Hungary, and the Continent is being divided into hostile armed camps. Austria is starving to death and cannot survive unless she is allowed to unite with Germany or Hungary. The great majority of Austrians desire union with Germany, but that is forbidden by the Treaty of St. Germain, and France will not hear of it. At any moment there may be an explosion.

If England and Italy acted together on the right lines they could probably bring France to reason. But, unfortunately, Lloyd George has no consistent policy. The British Foreign Office, true to its old tradition of the balance of power, is naturally hostile to the French policy. It is not to the interest of England that Germany should be destroyed or that France should secure the hegemony of Europe. Instinctively England throws her weight in the balance on the side of Germany. Lloyd George is working in an underhand way for the revision of the treaties, in favor of Germany and Austria, but he dares not openly avow his aim, since he has no intention of revising the treaties in any points affecting British interests. His policy in regard to Russia varies according to the military successes or failures of the Russian army, and the negotiations for the resumption of trade relations are now being delayed in the hope, probably vain, that the present Russian Government is about to fall. The result is that he has hopelessly estranged French feeling without any corresponding advantage. England would be less disliked in France had he adopted a frank and consistent policy opposed to that of the French Government. One cannot open a French comic paper without finding Lloyd George caricatured as the incarnation of British hypocrisy and the personification of "perfide Albion."

It was possible to maintain Anglo-French friendship only on one condition—that of making a just and democratic peace. From the moment that Lloyd George and Clemenceau decided to make an imperialist and Carthaginian peace, a quarrel over the division of the spoils was inevitable. The only way to save Europe now is to scrap the imperialist and Carthaginian peace and make a new one on different lines. That involves the sacrifice of the spoils that England, or rather Lloyd George's capitalist friends, have appropriated. England cannot ask France to revise the treaties until she, herself, has clean hands. Nor can France be asked to consent to a revision of arrangements touching her interests, or supposed interests, unless England consent to a revision of the arrangements that touch England, such as those concerning the German colonies. I see little hope so long as England is governed by a charlatan whose sole concern is to stick in office. The one ray of hope is the apparent disposition of the French Government to discuss the question of reparations directly with Germany. A satisfactory understanding between France and Germany would go far to make European peace at last possible. But if it led, as the *Vossische Zeitung* desires, to a Continental alliance against England, all the mischief would begin over again. The remedy is the United States of Europe with Free Trade and disarmament. We must come to that or perish.

Twilight of the Gods

By LEONORA SPEYER

Tonight
Dusk shuddered away from the autumn sky
Too cruel-bright:
Into the comfort of the West
She slipped, a wound in her shadowy breast,
Glowing and deep and red,
Out of the day—to grieve and die,
Hanging her head.

But I
Will wear my one-time bliss of you
More valiantly!
Pinned to my gown like a meadow-flower
Or the proud, red gem of my woman's dower,
And never its wound revealed—
The aching, eloquent kiss of you,
Unhealed!

Contributors to This Issue

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON is Professor of History at the University of Chicago.

OTTO H. KAHN is a leading figure in the financial world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U. S. Steel *vs.* Margolis

By SWINBURNE HALE

TO any one who has read the Interchurch World Report on the Steel Strike, or the Twelve Lawyers' Report on the Department of Justice, the disbarment of Jacob Margolis comes as no surprise. Mr. Margolis has been deported from the legal profession; that is all. He has been deported exactly as union organizers have been deported from steel towns. He has been deported exactly as alien radicals have been deported from the country. He has been put out, ejected, by "force and violence" one might almost say, from the means of earning a living, because he holds views widely divergent from the accepted views of the people who run Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

The Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, which has acted, sits in the very heart of the Pittsburgh Steel district. Judges Shafer and Ford are the same two judges who, upon being prayed to enjoin Mayor Babcock and the police from interfering with a local union holding its business meetings (not even mass meetings, but business meetings), denied the writ, saying that "it must be left to the reasonable discretion of the officers charged with keeping the peace, when such intervention is made." This is the same Allegheny County whose Sheriff proclaimed that any assembling and loitering of three people in the streets of Pittsburgh constituted an unlawful assembly. This is the county upon which centered the influences that the Interchurch World Commission reported as follows:

> The maintenance of the non-unionism alternative, therefore, entailed for the steel companies activities running from spies in church offices in New York to sealed carloads of Negroes shipped into the Pittsburgh plant yards at night. For communities and for States the alternative contained activities of greater import and greater menace. These affected civil liberties in whole communities, *local legislative bodies, police authorities, judges, State police troops, Federal Government departments, and the United States Army.*

Specifically, Jacob Margolis was charged before this honorable court "with conduct totally destructive of the Government which he took an oath to support." Specifically it was held by this honorable court that Margolis "has done his utmost to breed unrest among the lawless and vicious and to incite them to acts of violence and disloyalty." Specifically the evidence shows merely and absolutely that Jacob Margolis, being a fluent and profound student of radical philosophies, had come to believe primarily in the Tolstoyan doctrine of pacifist non-resistance, and secondarily in a combination of the Tolstoyan doctrine of the unnecessariness of government as such, and the syndicalist doctrine of producers' control of industrial process; and further, that Mr. Margolis, having accepted these doctrines, proceeded to impart them to other persons either individually or in general meetings. No act of any kind in derogation of the actual existing authority of Government by Mr. Margolis was shown or indicated. No credible suggestion of any advocacy of resistance to law is to be found in the record beyond the usual kind of evidence familiar to the point of nausea in deportation cases and in the Senate investigation of the steel strike—namely, that Mr. Margolis had defended members of the I. W. W. in court; that I. W. W.'s held syndicalist views; that one W. Z. Foster had once written a "little red book" about syndicalism, in which he said that the syndicalist allows no considerations of legality or patriotism to stand in the way of effective tactics; and that, therefore, Mr. Margolis must be taken to be a lawyer who allowed no consideration of legality to stand in the way of a forcible eviction of the government at Washington.

The court found that Mr. Margolis is an Anarchist, a Syndicalist, a Bolshevik, an I. W. W., and an active supporter of an organization called the Union of Russian Workers, "whose principal publication is *Nova Misky.*"

Now, a man may at the same time, in the view of the Pittsburgh judges, be an anarchist who believes in no government and be a Bolshevik who believes in about the most strongly centralized government ever devised. But it is quite, quite true that no such "publication" as *Nova Misky* has ever been issued by anybody anywhere, as a principal publication or otherwise. There is a pamphlet entitled "Two Dictatorships" by Novomirsky, which was published in Odessa in 1905 for the purposes of the Russian revolution of that year, and there is a "Manifesto" of the same Novomirsky, published in Odessa in 1907 after the failure of the previous Russian revolution. These Odessa editions have been in the New York Public Library for years, familiar to students of radical literature. They were taken out of the New York Public Library by a member of the Union of Russian Workers to be reprinted for Russian readers, together with books on botany, philosophy, arithmetic, and other subjects, and they have been used by Mr. Palmer and his Department of Justice agents to scare people with ever since.

It is worth noting that the evidence did show that private letters addressed to Mr. Margolis, and in the custody of the Post Office Department, were somehow or other copied or photostated before they got to him; that private telephone conversations between Mr. Margolis and his acquaintances were somehow or other tapped and written down; and that somehow or other private telegrams sent by radicals found their way into the possession of the Department of Justice —an interesting sidelight on the criminal espionage which has come to be a part of modern American institutions.

The essence of Mr. Margolis's testimony was as follows:

> I have such faith in our common humanity that I believe if we got rid of the central question, which is the question of owners versus producers, and if we could get the new ideological basis, upon creation rather than possession, and every individual in our society would contribute his work, there would be no need for any government.

The difficulty of the court's mental process lay in the impossibility of its conceiving that any lawyer could have such faith in a possible reconstruction of society, and at the same time support the Constitution and live according to the laws. With equal logic could Mr. Morris Hillquit be disbarred for believing in and urging "a system of social production for collective use" in direct disagreement with the Constitution. That either Mr. Margolis or Mr. Hillquit intends to recognize and to act under the Constitution while it remains the Constitution, is a fact incapable of lodgment in the judicial mind of Allegheny County.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Failure of the League

By OTTO H. KAHN

FOR the troublous state and the continuing dispeace of the world, the wrongs and faults of the Peace Treaty of Versailles (and that of St. Germain) are more responsible, in my opinion, than any other factor, next, of course, to the war itself. A strongly contributory element has been the unpreparedness and planlessness of our Government for those economic tasks which, with the cessation of the war, became incumbent upon us.

The Peace Treaty is not reconcilable with either good faith or good sense. The Treaty falls grievously short of realizing the high hopes of the world for a peace worthy of the spirit which animated the Allies and America during the war. The ill-omened instrument has come to plague its very beneficiaries and to cause discord and ill-feeling among those who had been comrades in arms. Liberal opinion in the allied and neutral countries is unanimous in condemning it. Among the many people whom I had occasion to see during my recent journey in Europe, there were very few indeed outside of the immediate circle of its responsible authors, who would deny its faultiness.

The representatives of the United States should never have yielded to that Treaty, not only because their more detached view ought to have shown them the harmful consequences which were bound to flow from it, but because in spirit and in letter it failed to carry out pledges made by us —pledges to our own people, to the enemy people, and to the world at large.

Given the commanding prestige which, at the time, adhered to America and her spokesman, and given the need and expectation of the Allied governments of America's financial and economic aid, there can be little doubt that it was in our power to secure a treaty which would have complied with declarations solemnly made, which would have befitted the spirit in which the war was fought to victory and which would have brought to the world, real peace.

The League of Nations Covenant was inserted in the Treaty upon President Wilson's insistence and against the opposition, originally, of his fellow treaty makers. They finally consented to the insertion of such a Covenant, mainly as a means to obtain his acquiescence in the conditions of the Treaty, and to assuage his scruples. They became more and more reconciled to it as they succeeded in shaping the Covenant according to their intent and making out of it, largely, an instrument of political dominion, containing, moreover, no effective provision either as to disarmament or as to the much-vaunted "freedom of the seas." They became wholly for it when Article X guaranteed the cooperation of the United States in preserving the world forever as the treaty makers had arbitrarily carved up and apportioned it, and when another provision of the Covenant sought to make their handiwork trebly ironclad by stipulating that no essential modification could be effected, except by unanimous consent of the principal Powers concerned and advantaged.

In what instance in the record of European diplomacy was there ever unanimity when selfish interests were at stake, except unanimity purchased by equally selfish compromises and bargainings? Does the present state of Europe under the dispensation, for the past eighteen months, of the Supreme Council, composed of representatives of the leading nations, encourage faith in the effective and beneficent workings of international unanimity?

It has been well said by a distinguished English Liberal, a former member of the Cabinet:

"If you are to ask the world to guarantee the world's peace, it is essential to begin by establishing a foundation on which peace can stand. This treaty has done the exact opposite. It has established conditions full of menace for the future and it asks the League of Nations to guarantee that they shall continue. It is asking too much."

In the shape in which it emerged from the deliberations of the treaty makers, I consider the League of Nations Covenant insincere, ineffective, unsuited to the aim of preserving peace and promoting international justice, and involving the United States in commitments which are uncalled for and irreconcilable with our traditions, institutions, aims, and ideals.

Nothing that America fought for in the late war, or promised, makes it incumbent upon us to entangle ourselves in the age-long racial squabbles and intrigues of Europe and Asia, or to become the guardians and guarantors of an arbitrarily and artificially remodeled world, put together according to the perceptions, predilections and compromises of a few men assembled in secret conclave, far removed from the informing and vitalizing currents of public opinion, and not sufficiently removed always from considerations of domestic political expediency.

Nothing that we fought for, or promised, makes it incumbent upon us to relinquish our fundamental national policies and traditions.

We helped mightily to win the war. Alone among the victors, we asked for none of the spoils. We sought no gain in return for what we freely gave in men, in money and in effort. We obtained no material advantage. Surely, we are not justly called upon to set America's signature to an instrument that would leave us poorer in those intangible national assets which we have jealously guarded heretofore and which we rightly prize.

I believe that our participation in the League as now constituted, with its cumbersome machinery, complexity and rigid formulae, instead of promoting harmony and goodwill, would be apt rather to breed misunderstandings, irritation and ill-feeling between European nations and ourselves.

Many of those who advocate our "going in" admit that the Covenant (as well as the Treaty) is faulty, but urge that the necessary corrections can and will be made after we have joined. I consider that the time to correct admitted faults, in the charter and by-laws of an association you propose to join, is before you have joined and not afterwards, especially when it is provided that after you have joined, modifications cannot be effected except by unanimous consent.

The argument is often heard that, inasmuch as some forty nations have joined the League, we cannot expect so large an aggregation of nations to abide by our views as to the conception and working methods of an association of peoples. The argument has a plausible sound, but is, I believe, devoid of substance. I have personally no doubt whatever that any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

readjustment or modification of the Covenant which is agreed upon between England, France, and America, *before* we "go in," will meet with the ready acquiescence of all other nations concerned.

I deplore the fact that this subject has become a matter of political controversy. My own views are in no way colored by political, personal, or any other preconceptions, by any spirit of undue leniency toward Germany, or by any inclination to condone her fearful wrong.

I am in favor of any wise and fitting pact to preserve the peace of the world. I am in favor of America's taking her full share in the burden of that responsibility which rightfully goes with power. But after mature consideration I am bound to agree wholly with Senator Harding's position as outlined in his speech of August 28, and further elaborated in his Des Moines speech on October 7.

The truly great service which we can and ought to render to a world sorely in need, and which it is our duty and our self-interest to render without delay and without stint, is not political, but humanitarian and economic.

The Irish Committee Chosen

JUST as we go to press the acceptances of the five members of the Commission of Inquiry, elected by members of The Committee of One Hundred on Ireland, have been received. The balloting was completed Monday, and acceptances were received within twenty-four hours. *The Nation* takes great pleasure in announcing the names, as follows: Jane Addams, former Governor Joseph W. Folk, Frederic C. Howe, James H. Maurer, United States Senator David I. Walsh. Miss Addams received more than twice as many votes as any other nominee, and the others were closely bunched.

A brief biography of each of the members of the Commission follows:

JANE ADDAMS: As a worker, lecturer, and writer for social betterment she has won a reputation that makes her one of the most distinguished women in the world, one who has never refused a call to high public service. For over thirty years Miss Addams has been head of Hull House, Chicago. She is Chairman of the Woman's Peace Party and of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace, and in 1919 served as President of the International Congress of Women held in Switzerland.

JOSEPH WINGATE FOLK: A native of Tennessee, his public career has been largely identified with the State of Missouri. He won his spurs as circuit attorney in St. Louis by fearlessly exposing political corruption. He was subsequently elected Governor of the State on the Democratic ticket by a large majority in a Republican year. His record as Governor stands as one of the particularly bright spots in American political life. During the Wilson administration he served for a time as solicitor for the State Department, and since 1914 has been chief counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission. He is also general counsel for the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

FREDERIC CLEMSON HOWE: He is one of the foremost American authorities on economic and social subjects, particularly on taxation and municipal government. He has been Professor of Law at the Cleveland College of Law, lecturer on Taxation at Western Reserve University, and lecturer on Municipal Administration and Politics at the University of Wisconsin. He has held several public offices, including that of Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York, from 1914 to 1919. He rendered conspicuous service as an expert on international affairs attached to the American delegation at the Peace Conference.

JAMES H. MAURER: For many years he has been President of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor. He is known as an authority on labor conditions and problems, and is a power in the progressive wing of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Maurer has served several terms as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature from the Reading district.

DAVID I. WALSH: He has had a notable public career in his native state. Admitted to the bar in 1897, he began his public service as moderator at town meetings, was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and served subsequently as Lieutenant Governor and Governor. He was chosen as delegate at large to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1917. His term in the United States Senate began last year, and as a new member his vigorous personality immediately made itself felt. "If I considered my personal desires I would decline the service offered," he wired *The Nation*, "but the patriotic and humanitarian aspects of this service compel me to forget self. I will serve with other members who will undertake this work with open mind and without prejudice of any kind."

The Nation congratulates the members of the Committee of One Hundred on securing the services of Americans of such conspicuous ability to make this earnest attempt to find a way toward peace in Ireland. The Commission will meet to organize at the earliest possible moment, and at that point *The Nation's* direct connection with the matter will end. It is expected that the taking of testimony will begin at Washington within a fortnight.

The need for making a beginning without delay is emphasized day by day in the news from Ireland. The alarming increase of legalized lawlessness and terrorism in that hapless land, following the overwhelming vote in the British Parliament against Arthur Henderson's motion for an Irish investigation, makes a competent, non-political American inquiry all the more necessary and urgent.

The realization of the urgency of this matter has been reflected in letters we are receiving from all parts of the country, alike from friends of Irish welfare and friends of British honor, and from impartial Americans who never hesitate to respond when they hear of people suffering and dying. Not a few of these letters are accompanied by substantial evidence of support. Since Mr. John E. Milholland opened the nation-wide fund for the inquiry with a contribution of five hundred dollars, contributions large and small have been coming in from persons of every shade of opinion, including a Jewish workingman born in Poland, who sent in his mite to assist an alien race toward justice and peace. English, Scotch, and Irish societies in this country have been requested to "adopt" witnesses and bring them over from Ireland for the inquiry, and several have responded with pledges for $1,000, which sum will cover the cost of bringing over a single person. The organization of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish County Societies here has taken up the matter of raising funds for the inquiry, and several of these organizations are actively at work. In short, a start has been made toward providing for the work of the Commission. Necessarily the inquiry will be costly, but if the Commission can contribute toward bringing to an end the horrible plight of the Irish people, the amount is insignificant.

His Eminence Cardinal Logue has cabled from Ireland that "every assistance shall be given to the Committee," and messages of sympathy and support have come from many persons in Canada.

Following a formal assurance received from the British Embassy that "no one will be refused a passport on the ground that he or she desires to give evidence on either side," the Secretary of the Committee of One Hundred has received the following letter from Sir Auckland Geddes:

BRITISH EMBASSY, WASHINGTON,
23rd October, 1920

SIR:

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant respecting your proposal to form an unofficial Committee of Inquiry with reference to recent occurrences in Ireland. To this I have given careful consideration.

I venture to say that no one who realizes what the present position in Ireland involves in the sorrow and suffering of men, women, and children can fail to be anxious that a way should be found to bring tranquillity to that country. The British Government has more to gain than anyone in insuring that the truth is made known to the whole world. I am, however, unable to bring myself to believe that the truth can be established until there has been a period of quiet in Ireland. Any inquiry undertaken just now, more especially any inquiry undertaken by persons of less than the greatest experience of the laws of evidence and without power to compel the production of books, papers, records, etc., would, in my opinion, lead to a mass of statements, unsupported by verifiable facts, being made for propaganda purposes.

Sincere friends of Ireland should, it appears to me, do everything in their power to persuade all desirous of obtaining a solution of the age-long Irish problem that the first and deepest interest of Ireland is to secure that period of quiet which will alone make settlement possible by providing the opportunity for voices now inaudible to make themselves heard above the din.

As you were informed in the letter from this Embassy of October 11th, the British Government will refuse no one a passport to the United States on the ground that he or she desires to give evidence on either side before your committee. It was added that, while His Majesty's Government would take no steps against any British subject who might elect to give evidence before the committee, they could not guarantee that no reprisals would be enforced by Sinn Fein extremists in Ireland against persons who have given evidence against certain elements in that movement, should such persons return to Ireland. I may add that nothing will be done by the British Government to encourage the holding of this inquiry or to assist witnesses to appear before the committee.

Yours truly,
(*Signed*) A. GEDDES

WILLIAM MACDONALD, ESQ.
"The Nation,"
20 Vesey Street,
New York.

We trust that the work of the Commission, as it develops, will enlist the support of Sir Auckland, at least to the extent of furthering the presentation of the British side of the situation. We believe that he underrates the seriousness of the feeling aroused throughout our citizenship by the tragic case of Ireland. The action of Parliament on October 19 in rejecting by a great majority the motion for an official Irish inquiry makes it plain that in that body there is little realization of the feeling here. The Parliament's prompt support of the frank appeal to brutality made by Sir Hamar Greenwood can not but fill every lover of Ireland and every lover of England in this country with amazement and dismay. "Yes, they were murders; call them murders," declared Sir Hamar, in defiant response to an outcry against his defense of the British policy of repraisals in Ireland. While he stated in a formal and perfunctory manner that the Government deplored the lawless terrorism of its armed forces in Ireland, he proceeded most vigorously to defend the outrages and laud the perpetrators.

Both Sir Hamar Greenwood and Andrew Bonar Law assured the House that reprisals and disorders in Ireland had been "greatly reduced" by the Government's policy. Dispatches from Ireland on the day this statement was made and on the two preceding days, printed in the New York *Times*, scarcely bear out this statement. A summary of the dispatches follows:

Oct. 18.

Two civilians fatally shot in military raid on public hall in Dublin, said to be a reprisal for the wounding of two officers in a "commandeered" launch.

Bombs thrown at several shops in Tipperary by uniformed men.

Police barracks at Ruan, County Clare, raided by civilians.

Oct. 19.

Two farmers at Ballydavid in Tipperary roused from bed at midnight and shot dead by a party of men in military uniform.

A man named Doyle at Ballygar, County Galway, called to the door of his home at night and shot through the heart by policemen. In a series of domiciliary visits, on the same evening, shots were fired through windows and four men were arrested by the police.

Three creameries and a public hall burned as reprisal by British forces near Traloe, where Sinn Feiners recently seized military stores.

The population terrified, windows smashed, and one civilian wounded in raids by "Black and Tans" in military cars at Drogheda.

Oct. 20.

Raids by crown officers in force on Sackville Street, Dublin. One civilian wounded.

Michael Walsh, "an Urban Councillor and a well-known Sinn Feiner," taken from his shop by armed men. His body, with bullet wounds in the head, "was subsequently found in the river. Recently his house had been twice raided and bombed."

There is every reason to hope that the forthcoming inquiry under the auspices of an American Committee of distinguished membership will suggest to the governing group in Great Britain a way out of the maze of horrors in which they are wandering in Ireland. It is of vital importance, before any measure of improvement can come in Ireland, that the facts in the case be impartially established. This necessary groundwork the Commission of Inquiry will perform. Its high mission will be to assist toward opening a way to peace in Ireland. In this it will render to Great Britain, to Ireland and to the world, a service beyond price.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Platform, Socialist Party 1920

[Pursuant to the request of many of *The Nation's* readers, we print herewith the platform of the Socialist Party, 1920.]

IN the national campaign of 1920 the Socialist Party calls upon all American workers of hand and brain, and upon all citizens who believe in political liberty and social justice, to free the country from the oppressive misrule of the old political parties, and to take the government into their own hands under the banner and upon the program of the Socialist Party.

The outgoing administration, like Democratic and Republican administrations of the past, leaves behind it a disgraceful record of solemn pledges unscrupulously broken and public confidence ruthlessly betrayed.

It obtained the suffrage of the people on a platform of peace, liberalism, and social betterment, but drew the country into a devastating war, and inaugurated a regime of despotism, reaction, and oppression unsurpassed in the annals of the republic.

It promised to the American people a treaty which would assure to the world a reign of international right and true democracy. It gave its sanction and support to an infamous pact formulated behind closed doors by predatory elder statesmen of European and Asiatic Imperialism. Under this pact territories have been annexed against the will of their populations and cut off from their source of sustenance; nations seeking their freedom in the exercise of the much-heralded right of self-determination have been brutally fought with armed force, intrigue, and starvation blockades.

To the millions of young men who staked their lives on the field of battle, to the people of the country who gave unstintingly of their toil and property to support the war, the Democratic administration held out the sublime ideal of a union of the peoples of the world organized to maintain perpetual peace among nations on the basis of justice and freedom. It helped create a reactionary alliance of imperialistic governments, banded together to bully weak nations, crush working-class governments, and perpetuate strife and warfare.

While thus furthering the ends of reaction, violence, and oppression abroad, our administration suppressed the cherished and fundamental rights and civil liberties at home.

Upon the pretext of war-time necessity, the Chief Executive of the republic and the appointed heads of his administration were clothed with dictatorial powers (which were often exercised arbitrarily), and Congress enacted laws in open and direct violation of the constitutional safeguards of freedom of expression.

Hundreds of citizens who raised their voices for the maintenance of political and industrial rights during the war were indicted under the Espionage Law, tried in an atmosphere of prejudice and hysteria, and many of them are now serving inhumanly long jail sentences for daring to uphold the traditions of liberty which once were sacred in this country.

Agents of the Federal Government unlawfully raided homes and meeting places and prevented or broke up peaceable gatherings of citizens.

The Postmaster-General established a censorship of the press more autocratic than ever tolerated in a regime of absolutism, and has harassed and destroyed publications on account of their advanced political and economic views, by excluding them from the mails.

And after the war was in fact long over, the administration has not scrupled to continue a policy of repression and terrorism under the shadow and hypocritical guise of war-time measures.

It has practically imposed involuntary servitude and peonage on a large class of American workers by denying them the right to quit work and coercing them into acceptance of inadequate wages and onerous conditions of labor. It has dealt a foul blow to the traditional American right of asylum by deporting hundreds of foreign-born workers by administrative order, on the mere suspicion of harboring radical views, and often for the sinister purpose of breaking labor strikes.

In the short span of three years our self-styled liberal administration has succeeded in undermining the very foundation of political liberty and economic rights, which this republic has built up in more than a century of struggle and progress.

Under the cloak of a false and hypocritical patriotism and under the protection of governmental terror the Democratic administration has given the ruling classes unrestrained license to plunder the people by intensive exploitation of labor, by the extortion of enormous profits, and by increasing the cost of all necessities of life. Profiteering has become reckless and rampant, billions have been coined by the capitalists out of the suffering and misery of their fellow men. The American financial oligarchy has become a dominant factor in the world, while the condition of the American workers has grown more precarious.

The responsibility does not rest upon the Democratic Party alone. The Republican Party through its representatives in Congress and otherwise has not only openly condoned the political misdeeds of the last three years, but has sought to outdo its Democratic rival in the orgy of political reaction and repression. Its criticism of the Democratic administrative policy is that it is not reactionary and drastic enough.

America is now at the parting of the roads. If the outraging of political liberty, and concentration of economic power into the hands of the few is permitted to go on, it can have only one consequence, the reduction of the country to a state of absolute capitalist despotism.

We particularly denounce the militaristic policy of both old parties of investing countless hundreds of millions of dollars in armaments after the victorious completion of what was to have been the "last war." We call attention to the fatal results of such a program in Europe, carried on prior to 1914, and culminating in the Great War; we declare that such a policy, adding unbearable burdens to the working class and to all the people, can lead only to the complete Prussianization of the nation, and ultimately to war; and we demand immediate and complete abandonment of this fatal program.

The Socialist Party sounds the warning. It calls upon the people to defeat both parties at the polls, and to elect the candidates of the Socialist Party to the end of restoring political democracy and bringing about complete industrial freedom.

The Socialist Party of the United States therefore summons all who believe in this fundamental doctrine to prepare for a complete reorganization of our social system, based upon public ownership of public necessities; upon government by representatives chosen from occupational as well as from geographical groups, in harmony with our industrial development; and with citizenship based on service; that we may end forever the exploitation of class by class.

To achieve this end the Socialist Party pledges itself to the following program:

1. SOCIAL

1. All business vitally essential for the existence and welfare of the people, such as railroads, express service, steamship lines, telegraphs, mines, oil wells, power plants, elevators, packing houses, cold storage plants, and all industries operating on a national scale should be taken over by the nation.

2. All publicly owned industries should be administered jointly by the government and representatives of the workers, not for revenue of profit, but with the sole object of securing just compensation and humane conditions of employment to the workers and efficient and reasonable service to the public.

3. All banks should be acquired by the government, and incorporated in a unified public banking system.

4. The business of insurance should be taken over by the government, and should be extended to include insurance against accident, sickness, invalidity, old age, and unemployment, without contribution on the part of the worker.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. Congress should enforce the provisions of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments with reference to the Negroes, and effective federal legislation should be enacted to secure to the Negroes full civil, political, industrial, and educational rights.

2. INDUSTRIAL

1. Congress should enact effective laws to abolish child labor, to fix minimum wages, based on an ascertained cost of a decent standard of life, to protect migratory and unemployed workers from oppression, to abolish detective and strike-breaking agencies, and to establish a shorter work-day in keeping with increased industrial productivity.

3. POLITICAL

1. The constitutional freedom of speech, press, and assembly should be restored by repealing the Espionage Law and all other repressive legislation, and by prohibiting the executive usurpation of authority.

2. All prosecutions under the Espionage Law should be discontinued, and all persons serving prison sentences for alleged offenses growing out of religious beliefs, political views, or industrial activities should be fully pardoned and immediately released.

3. No alien should be deported from the United States on account of his political views or participation in labor struggles, nor in any event without proper trial on specific charges. The arbitrary power to deport aliens by administrative order should be repealed.

4. The power of the courts to restrain workers in their struggles against employers by the Writ of Injunction or otherwise, and their power to nullify congressional legislation, should be abrogated.

5. Federal judges should be elected by the people and be subject to recall.

6. The President and the Vice-President of the United States should be elected by direct popular election, and be subject to recall. All members of the Cabinet should be elected by Congress and be responsible at all times to the vote thereof.

7. Suffrage should be equal and unrestricted in fact as well as in law for all men and women throughout the nation.

8. Because of the strict residential qualification of suffrage in this country, millions of citizens are disfranchised in every election; adequate provision should be made for the registration and voting of migratory voters.

9. The Constitution of the United States should be amended to strengthen the safeguards of civil and political liberty, and to remove all obstacles to industrial and social reform, and reconstruction, including the changes enumerated in this program, in keeping with the will and interest of the people. It should be made amendable by a majority of the voters of the nation upon their own initiative, or upon the initiative of Congress.

4. FOREIGN RELATIONS

1. All claims of the United States against allied countries for loans made during the war should be canceled upon the understanding that all war debts among such countries shall likewise be canceled. The largest possible credit in food, raw material, and machinery should be extended to the stricken nations of Europe in order to help them rebuild the ruined world.

2. The Government of the United States should initiate a movement to dissolve the mischievous organization called the "League of Nations" and to create an international parliament, composed of democratically elected representatives of all nations of the world, based upon the recognition of their equal rights, the principles of self-determination, the right to national existence of colonies and other dependencies, freedom of international trade and trade routes by land and sea, and universal disarmament, and be charged with revising the Treaty of Peace on the principles of justice and conciliation.

3. The United States should immediately make peace with the Central Powers and open commercial and diplomatic relations with Russia under the Soviet Government. It should promptly recognize the independence of the Irish Republic.

4. The United States should make and proclaim it a fixed principle in its foreign policy that American capitalists, who acquire concessions or make investments in foreign countries, do so at their own risk, and under no circumstances should our government enter into diplomatic negotiations or controversies or resort to armed conflicts on account of foreign property-claims of American capitalists.

5. FISCAL

1. All war debts and other debts of the Federal Government should immediately be paid in full, the funds for such payment to be raised by means of a progressive property tax, whose burdens should fall upon the rich and particularly upon great fortunes made during the war.

2. A standing progressive income tax and a graduated inheritance tax should be levied to provide for all needs of the government, including the cost of its increasing social and industrial functions.

3. The unearned increment of land should be taxed, all land held out of use should be taxed at full rental value.

In the Driftway

OBERON, impenitent poet, was so wroth at the destruction of the Madison Square Church that he threatened to leave for Paris—and the Drifter recorded and sympathized with his woes. Now comes a venturesome spirit from Montreal, who not only suggests the substitution of Montreal for Paris, but declares thus that beauty is not after all without honor even in the purlieus of Wall Street:

Suppose you advise Oberon to come to Montreal? It is nearer than Paris, and here, too, they treat venerable objects with consideration. There is that little romanesque church building on the east side of Beaver Hall Hill, with its neatly proportioned campanile. When trade's unfeeling train usurped the district and dispossessed the parishioners, did they tear it down? No, sirree! Read the large sign in bold gilt letters on the façade: *Rapid Electrotype Company.* Beaver Hall Hill leads up to Beaver Hall Square, with the smoked and streaked sandstone fronts of its sober mansions, its patch of green, and, obscuring all in somber shadow, its rows of veteran elms—as Irving called them, the distinction of ancient families and the despair of a modern aristocracy. I used to marvel how it had withstood the industrial and commercial siege. Yet it had not: commerce and industry had long since taken possession, but in a spirit of reverence. One side of the square is occupied by a pulp and paper company. There is a sign informing you of the fact, but it does not obtrude. It is there merely for the benefit of those who seek. In Montreal the declining number of Episcopalians south of Phillips Square is not enough to scrap a thing of beauty. Let Oberon come here.

Yet, come to think of it, was not that Madison Square church an intruder? Did it not deliberately trespass upon territory long since ceded to commerce and industry? True, most Americans did not know it was there, but what mercy had it a right to expect once its presence was felt and discovered? How different the treatment accorded another building which found itself obstructing the progress of the Metropolitan! Some of us still remember the black and white marble structure which once occupied the northwest corner of Fourth Avenue and Twenty-third Street—a bank building or something. Its walls were taken down stone by stone with religious care, then put up again in the same order, stone by stone, and now inclose the Church of Our Lady of Lourdes on West 142d Street. A church house becomes an electrotype foundry; a bank building becomes a church house: thus is the supremacy of beauty vindicated.

That bank building was no interloper, so could claim consideration. Witness also old St. Paul's and Trinity. It dizzies me

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to try to compute the gold value of the ground they occupy. Yet there they stand, not merely tolerated but treated with propitiatory courtesy. They even determine the style of architecture of neighboring edifices. Who shall say that beauty does not count in America?

* * * * *

THE Drifter has never attended the noon services in old Trinity, so he does not know whether the brokers flock to hear the word of God in a house of beauty, nor do his Sunday mornings find him near enough to investigate whether any but reporters hear the Rev. William T. Manning's well-reported weekly diatribes, but he does cherish the warm brown stone that smiles benignly upon the cold rushing canyon of Wall Street, and his visits to the office of *The Nation* would lose half their adventure did they not offer occasion for new discoveries in the church-yard of St. Paul's. But though his undiscerning eye neglected the Madison Square Church dear to the heart of Oberon, the Drifter still holds it against civilization and the subway, against New York and America, that St. John's Church, which used, in his reporter days, to grace his nightly return through Varick Street, has gone the way of all good things that stand in the way of straight wide streets and rapid motorways. The peaceful Varick Street of those days, troubled only by an occasional horse-car, has become a horror of mighty power trucks, peaceful only in the wee small hours, one side still the quaint relic of a more restful city but the other the scarred victim of the subway and new traffic demands. And the Drifter, who sometimes rather enjoys a fit of passing melancholy, insists upon the privilege of mild protest.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

A British View of Ireland

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The need for an impartial committee to investigate Irish atrocities was never so urgent as now. The following quotation from the leading editorial in the London *Nation* of October 2nd gives a British point of view. How many people in America realize the true state of affairs?

"'*Formerly in Ireland if a police officer were murdered there was no thought of direct reprisals in the minds of the R.I.C.; they thought only of bringing the murderer to justice, confident that he would be dealt with quickly and adequately by the courts. But now the machinery of the law having broken down, they feel there is no certain means of redress and punishment, and it is only human that they should act on their own initiative.* PUNISHMENT FOR SUCH ACTS IS A DELICATE MATTER, FOR IT MIGHT BE INTERPRETED AS SETTING AT NAUGHT THE HOPED-FOR EFFECT OF THE TRAINING THE OFFICERS HAVE GIVEN THEIR MEN.'—General Macready to a representative of the Associated Press of America, September 10, 1920.

"Is the British Government to lose its place among the civilized governments of the world, and to sink under their odium and contempt? That and nothing less is the question on which the British people have to make up their minds. Few who read the report of General Macready's comments on Balbriggan to an American interviewer could have believed that they were in truth reading the language of a British general; few could have believed that if a British general had so spoken, any British Government would have left him for twenty-four hours in his command. The interview was published in the evening papers of Saturday. Tuesday's papers, instead of announcing the general's recall, reported another episode of the kind that he finds it a "delicate" matter to punish, forty houses having been burnt to the ground in the town of Trim in the early hours of Monday morning. Next day another town—Mallow—suffered the same fate.

"For every hour this barbarian force remains in existence, the British Government remains outside the civilized order. It can say nothing about Lenin's Chinese executioners. It can call in the famous report on the Belgian atrocities, and ask Lord Bryce to make a public apology to Germany for the rude things he said about her soldiers. For it has come to this, that we have raised a mercenary force in England—it being no longer possible to recruit for the R.I.C. in Ireland—among demobilized officers out of a job, that we give these men a sovereign a day with their keep, and let them understand, by one kind of *sous-entendu* or another, that as soon as they find themselves on the other side of the Irish Sea they may kill, wound, burn, and loot as they please. Even so determined an opponent of Nationalist Ireland as Mr. Garvin calls this force by the name of "Bashi-Bazouks," and it needs no special insight to tell us that men recruited under these circumstances for such a job are the last men in the world to be trusted with this horrible discretion over the lives of men and women. Among the millions who went through the war there are left idle at this moment a number of reckless and desperate men, accustomed to its excitement and barbarism, who find settled life forbidding, and for such men paid lawlessness in Ireland has greater attractions than any prospects of adventure that offer themselves at home. The Government have deliberately recruited for service in Ireland a body of men to whom Ireland means nothing more than the opportunity for violence presented in any occupied enemy country and, having recruited such a body, they allow it or encourage it to become what such a force became in Russia. They are called the "Black and Tans." But their real name is the "Black Hundreds."

"This is nothing less than the deliberate overthrow of the civilized order and the proclamation of Anarchy as God and Law. It is a return to primitive times and primitive habits. It looks as if we were bent on bringing on ourselves a worse reproach than Germany earned in 1914 when she went into a great crime almost without a protest. The German politicians had at least the excuse that their country was at war. That is a bad excuse, but it is better than any that Englishmen will find for their silence today."

New York, October 21 JOHN T. WENTWORTH

The American Legion's Indorsements

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of October 13 there is a paragraph referring to the American Legion Convention at Cleveland, and criticizing several of the things done there; namely, indorsement of bonus legislation, compulsory military training, prohibition of immigration from Japan.

The first of these certainly represents not only the opinion of the Legion, but the opinion of 90 per cent of the ex-service men of the country, whatever may be your opinion of the wisdom of the action. The last of these was indorsed after considerable discussion, the viewpoint of most of the delegates being that the ex-service men of the Pacific Coast, who were on the ground and in close touch with the facts of the case, were a unit on the proposition, and that it was up to the ex-service men of the rest of the country to help them out.

On the matter of conscription, however, the action was taken in such a way that no discussion of it was possible. It came up in the report of the Committee for Military Affairs. While this report was being read, the Convention was presided over by one of the vice-presidents—a gentleman who knew nothing about parliamentary procedure, and who also was so deaf that he could scarcely hear the motions which were made. Consequently, between his efforts to hear and his efforts to find out what he should do next, he failed to call for any discussion of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the report and, before most of the delegates knew what he was doing, took a vote on the adoption of the report. Immediately thereafter a delegation of women was received and, about an hour afterwards, when their part of the program was completed, it was announced that the report of the Military Affairs Committee had been adopted.

After these proceedings, I asked about twenty of the delegates if in their opinion the report had indorsed universal compulsory military training in time of peace. Most of them were so confused about the proceedings that they did not know what had happened, but none of them believed that the Legion had put itself on record as favoring conscription. Furthermore, only one of them stated that he was in favor of conscription; the other nineteen being opposed to it.

From the above you can judge just what the Legion indorsement of conscription amounts to. It is, indeed, unfortunate that such things as this are possible, and it is the hope of all friends of the Legion that its organization will become so democratic that action on important questions such as this shall originate with the local posts, instead of with the national organization.

The resolution of the National Executive Committee calling for the dismissal of Louis F. Post is another example of undemocratic control which the Legion must do away with before it can ever expect to become the One Big Union of ex-service men to which it aspires.

WALLACE S. THOMAS,
Delegate from Ohio to the Nat'l Convention at Cleveland.
Springfield, Ohio, October 15

Misuse of America's Power

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A public service of unusual value was performed by you in exposing the conditions of the American occupation in Haiti and Santo Domingo. Few people were aware of the extent to which this country had been committed by the Secretaries of State and the Navy, and the pains which had been taken to keep them in ignorance of the facts are evidenced by the many "statements," "explanations," and "reports," now being issued —none of which goes to the heart of the issues raised by Mr. Johnson's articles and your editorials. In exposing the misuse of America's power *The Nation* has lived up to its best traditions, and deserves the thanks of all citizens, irrespective of party, who believe in justice to little nations as well as to big ones.

Washington, October 11 S. M. KENDRICK

Whom Gompers Supports

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Press reports quote Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, as saying in a speech on October 13 at Baltimore before the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders: "I am urging all, not to cast their votes for Harding and that police-baiter, Coolidge, but for Cox and Roosevelt." In his Labor Day speech at Columbus, Mr. Gompers praised President Wilson and classed him with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Yet Mr. Wilson, under date of Washington, D. C., November 5, 1919, sent this telegram to Governor Calvin Coolidge:

"I congratulate you upon your election as a victory for law and order. When that is the issue all Americans stand together."

Is that message of commendation to the "police-baiter" one of the acts constituting Wilson a great man in the estimation of Gompers? Does the candidate of Mr. Gompers indorse the Wilson telegram? Will Gompers ask Cox to repudiate the action of Wilson? Wilson has indorsed Cox. Cox has indorsed Wilson.

Cincinnati, October 14 ALFRED HENDERSON

Wherein the Difference Lies

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I want to thank you for your keenly analytical editorial, "Don't Throw Away Your Vote," which should be in the hands of every voter before Election Day.

When the newspapers of the country are, whether malevolently or maliciously, withholding not only the purposes and plans of "the Farmer-Labor Party," but even the fact that there is such a party, it is important that such reliable opinion-makers as is your *Nation* should bring the fact before the people—and it is proportionately appreciated.

In reply to the letter in your issue of the sixth, from Mr. Hutchins of Baltimore, I would like to say that while I have no grievance with any one who wants to vote the Socialist ticket and for Mr. Debs, and while I most heartily commend his spirit of protest against those who are seeking to destroy the very spirit of Americanism, I object very seriously to calling the Farmer-Labor Party a "replica of the two main parties."

To mention a few particulars in which the Farmer-Labor Party differs from the two main parties: It stands for the "restoration of civil liberties . . . including free speech, free press, free assemblage, right of asylum, equal opportunity, and trial by jury; return of the Department of Justice to the functions for which it was created." It stands for a plebiscite before the declaration of war, except in case of actual military invasion; for a refusal to permit our troops to aid in the exploitation of weaker people, as they are now doing in Haiti and Santo Domingo, under one of the "two main parties"; it stands for a recognition of the elected governments of Ireland and Russia; it stands for the democratic control of industry "in accordance with the experience of actual operation"; for public ownership and operation of public utilities, including railroads, mines, stockyards, grain elevators and storage plants.

To quote all the differences between the Farmer-Labor Party and the "two main parties" would be to waste costly paper, but that a comparison of the platforms of each of the three parties concerned would be convincing. The one big, outstanding difference is the spirit of the Farmer-Labor Party, which is that of service: the spirit of the "two main parties" is that of the divine right of kings.

Denver, October 7 H. E. KAHN

The Single Tax

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Just what is the matter with the Single Tax? Pray tell us in a near issue. You so-called liberals all seem to dodge it. In a way, you are worse than the reactionaries—you're trying to make the worn-out, rickety, wobbly-wheeled old social machine work—an impossibility. It can't be diddled. You occupy the exact position of Henry Clay, in the 50's. Patch it up—compromise—put a hitch here and a stitch there—do this—do that—do anything except the right thing. Why are you so afraid of realities? I don't see how anyone who stands for the institution of private monopoly of land can object to the late war, the failure at Paris, or Article X; they're all of the same breed of crawling things—all about a trumpery title and a patch of ground. Your railing doesn't hurt Wilson or Palmer or Burleson, at all; they are not afraid of you in your present position. But just say Single Tax to them, and see them coil up for a strike!

Avoid it as you will, gentlemen, dodge it as you may, the land question is the one that will be fought out, sooner or later, just as the slavery question finally had to be recognized in the 60's. That, and that alone, is the *chancre* from which emanates all this poison; it must be cured first. It is not the only remedy necessary, but it IS THE FIRST. Not more machinery, but a new machine!

East St. Louis, October 17 ED. CARSEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Religion Psychologically Justified

The Religious Consciousness. A Psychological Study. By James Bissett Pratt. The Macmillan Company.

IN religion, as in other matters, the testimony of an impartial witness is desirable and that of an "unwilling witness" has always been considered peculiarly precious. "The incomparable Boyle observes," wrote Cotton Mather, "that as to religious books, in general those which have been written by laymen and especially by gentlemen have (*caeteris paribus*) been better received and more effectual than those published by clergymen." So in the next age Lord Chesterfield, commending the habit of religious observances to his son, clinches his argument by reference to the belief in the justice and mercy of God avowed by that arch-freethinker Voltaire. In our own time likewise we find many people who are eager for some form of religious assurances turning away from the professional and accredited exponents of religious truth to accept the unwilling testimony of laconic ouija-boards, agitated table-legs, and photographic plates, which, with no conceivable prejudice or predisposition, are thought, by certain men of scientific reputation, to have testified to the reality of the spiritual world.

The spirits who think it worth their while to keep up a tittle-tattle with this world through table-legs and such devices are obviously beings of no consequence in time or eternity, the riffraff of Elysium to whom immortality has become a burden. "I never heard of anybody," said the elder Henry James, "whose wits were improved by conversation with these gentry." Any one desirous of conversing with the dead who yet live may decently do so by opening the Bible of any of the religions of the earth, where on any page he will find more evidence of the reality of the spiritual world than will ever be accumulated by those who "listen in" on the wireless telephones employed by Sir Oliver Lodge and the rest. And yet there is a certain struggling, misguided rightness in our contemporary passion for consulting table-legs! In a rather gross and comical and pathetic fashion it represents our rejection of the faiths that have not a leg to stand on. It grotesquely symbolizes our search for a witness that will rap out the hard facts uncolored by emotion.

Professor Pratt's point of view in the present volume is avowedly scientific. He aims to describe the religious consciousness as it presents itself for observation to the modern psychologist, that is to say, without any attempt to press behind phenomena into the realm of the Unknown or the Unknowable. An interesting feature of his treatment is a constant use of the results of recent questionnaires sent out to ascertain the present state of the religious consciousness among various classes of Americans. Not quite incidentally, he informs us that "among physical scientists 50.7 per cent believe in immortality; biologists 37 per cent; historians 51.5 per cent; psychologists 19.8 per cent. It is especially significant that the percentage of believers among the more eminent psychologists was only 8.8 per cent." The predisposition, therefore, of a modern psychologist to corroborate the testimony of the talkative table-leg is almost nil.

With the impartial curiosity of a psychologist, then, Professor Pratt enters the field of "comparative religion." His account of phenomena is remarkably fresh and instructive; and it differs commendably from some of its predecessors in emphasizing rather normal than exceptional types of experience. He has supplemented his acquaintance with religious literature by wide first-hand observation. He has studied the forms of Protestantism in America, especially among the better educated classes, enriching his collections of individual experience by extensive use of the questionnaire and by conferences with a generation of students. Roman Catholicism he has studied in Europe and at home under conditions which have enabled him to describe its power over the simple-hearted and over the mystic with sympathy and insight altogether unusual in one of Protestant upbringing. Finally, as those who have read his book on the faiths of India are aware, he has made his pilgrimage through India, Burma, and Ceylon, seeking initiation into the letter and the spirit of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism in mosque and shrine and temple, from peasants, teachers, priests, and holy men.

The first effect of the comparative study of religions upon an unsophisticated mind is probably unsettling—is, at any rate, to shake pretty thoroughly its faith in the unique virtues of the cult in which it was reared. But the second effect, the effect following reflection and criticism upon such data as Professor Pratt has amassed, is to persuade one that religion is rooted where it cannot be eradicated, in our "whole psycho-physical organism." Most of us are "incurably religious" because the natural and instinctive response of our bodies and minds to our total environment and to our racial and social inheritance produces in us an attitude towards the Determiner of Destiny, however we may conceive it; and produces also, inevitably, expression of that attitude, individual or collective. Thus private belief and public worship are to be regarded as functions of the constant constitution of man.

A scientific investigator who has reached a conclusion so important cannot be expected to sustain his air of impartiality after he has reached his conclusion. And from casual comment and criticism, scattered here and there through the volume, emerges Professor Pratt's own idea of the religion of an educated man. It does not differ by the world's breadth from that of the cultivated Brahmin. It has much in common with the religion of Pater's Marius. It is rational up to the limits of reason. "What is highest," he declares, "in the religious genius is to be sought in his conscious states rather than in some form of insensibility."

What psychology and the study of various religions suggests of especial interest is the genuine value of much of the "technique" of the religious life, which many have taught themselves to despise and discard. "Objective worship of the sort that aims to please the Deity" is for the man of our age "a thing of the past." Yet prayer and praise and social worship are still "psychologically justified" as means of self-culture, as methods of obtaining a vital feeling of the "reality" of those truths and aspirations which the intellect approves. It is significant that the last five chapters of the book deal with mysticism, the milder forms of which Professor Pratt finds not incompatible with his belief that in vigorous intelligence divinity is most likely to be found resident. As things are going now, he declares very truly, there is little danger of an overemphasis upon the value of that "clear dream and solemn vision," experienced, for example, by men like Milton—a kind of luminous ecstasy in which the enriched mind becomes delightedly aware of its relations with the mind of the world.

STUART P. SHERMAN

Reparation

The Making of the Reparation and Economic Sections of the Treaty. By Bernard M. Baruch. Harper and Brothers.

STRIPPED of a certain veneer of diplomatic courtesy, Mr. Baruch's argument is that the treaty is a poor treaty, but the best that could be obtained in view of the impossible election pledges of the British and of the war psychosis of the French. That is, after all, the only honest justification of the treaty possible, and the political situation in America might have been quite different had Woodrow Wilson had the intellectual honesty to adopt it.

Mr. Baruch was economic adviser to the American Commission at the Peace Conference, and American member of the Economic Drafting Committee, the Reparation Commission, the Economic Commission, and of the Supreme Economic Council;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no one is better qualified to tell the story of the drafting of the economic sections of the treaty. Mr. Keynes, who took an almost equally active part in the discussions, said that "there can have been few negotiations in history so contorted, so miserable, so utterly unsatisfactory to all parties." Mr. Baruch speaks with more caution and charity, although his conclusions are not as different from Mr. Keynes's as they seem. "Public opinion in the various Allied and Associated countries," he says, "had been aroused to a white heat of fear, hatred, and distrust. Facing these facts, one can easily realize the impossibility of arriving at a treaty free from passion and a sense of wrong." "From a superficial survey of the conditions that prevailed at the Peace Conference, one would have been quite justified in assuming that many of the participants preferred war with all its horrors to any peace short of that which they demanded." Insistence upon an "ideal peace" would have meant "the overthrow of at least three of the major governments" and the return of more violent rather than more moderate successors. And he concludes that the treaty under these circumstances "embodies all that could have been obtained." But he is far from concluding that it was a good treaty; though he lacks Mr. Keynes's moral indignation he is just as insistent that the apparent stringency of the treaty will have to be modified to meet economic inevitabilities; he differs chiefly in that he sees in the Reparations Commission an elastic agency capable of securing such modifications. So that he refuses to judge the treaty finally as it stands: "the measure of its worth lies in the processes of its execution and the spirit in which it is carried out by all the parties to the contract." As to that spirit he expresses a restrained hope but no judgment.

His book is less an argument than an exposition. Its authoritative story of the brave fight made by the American delegates at Paris for an honest interpretation of the pre-armistice negotiations as the contractual basis for the peace terms, is its most interesting section. Mr. Lloyd George had just waged a dishonest election campaign in large part upon the issue, "Make the Germans pay the whole cost of the war." The French Finance Minister, facing a budget impossible to balance, dared not admit how little could be retrieved from Germany. Financial experts of both France and England admitted the impossibility of retrieving the total costs from Germany, but wished, for political reasons, to assert the principle of full indebtedness and postpone discussion of actual payment to an indefinite future. The American delegates insisted, virtually alone, that the acceptance of the Fourteen Points as a basis for the terms of peace, with a reservation regarding reparations, bound the Entente powers to the terms of that reservation. The matter finally went from the Commission on Reparations to the Council of Four. Mr. Wilson was on the ocean, but he sent a message to the American delegation to dissent, "if necessary publicly," from the proposed procedure. The result was the acceptance of the American principle. It was the brave and honorable course for the President to take; its success confirms the belief that he might have had other successes had he appealed more frequently and boldly to public opinion instead of agreeing at the outset to a veil of secrecy which mildewed the entire conference. But the result upon the American delegation appears to have been to lead them to fear public conflict in which they might have been maneuvered into an attitude of apparent pro-Germanism. The position was difficult enough; Mr. Baruch calls the American attitude "charity," but the rapid verdict of history is hardly confirming that judgment.

There were other conflicts of opinion, and in the most important the American delegation was defeated. Mr. Baruch tells little of the discussion regarding the obviously unjustified inclusion of military pensions and separation allowances under the heading "damage done to the civilian population"; but he attributes the final decision to the influence of General Smuts. This is a charge of which more is likely to be heard. The refusal to fix the final amount which Germany would be called upon to pay was perhaps the most disastrous of the failures of the American delegation, although the issue was one of those which it fought hardest. Mr. Baruch gives us the American argument; it would be good reading had he given us some of the debate on the subject, as he does on the cost of the war question. The American argument for an honest facing of the situation seems irrefutable, but political considerations predominated, and the Americans were solaced with provisions which gave the Reparations Commission power to modify and interpret the treaty. This is, of course, being done, by conferences of the prime ministers; it is not being done, as Mr. Baruch hints, by the Reparations Commission, which is hamstrung by the severe necessity of unanimous decision. Mr. Baruch trusts that time will bring a more liberal view to the Entente statesmen and that the treaty is sufficiently elastic to admit of its own rewriting without a new peace conference. It is not, as a matter of fact, the potentially elastic terms of the treaty which are so modifying its terms; sections of the treaty are being scrapped by virtually forced agreement of the major Powers at conferences of the prime ministers which are in effect new peace conferences.

There will be no such storm of discussion aroused by Mr. Baruch's book as by Mr. Keynes's. Mr. Baruch has too much of that impractical optimism which was so characteristic of the American delegation throughout the Peace Conference and so fatal to its endeavors. It is a very slight book in size; half its bulk is a reprint, with marginal comments, of the reparations and economic sections of the treaty. But, though Mr. Baruch is still somewhat under the influence of the pall of Paris, he lifts something of the veil of secrecy, and when he does he speaks with authority, and not as the journalists. It is an invaluable contribution.

Mr. Baruch leaves the reader very proud of the series of positions taken by the American delegation. Whether or not the verdict of history be that it might have fought still more vigorously, or more publicly, against the stagnating atmosphere of the Conference, history must justify close to every position it took. On two points only is it likely to be condemned: on its refusal to continue the inter-Allied economic controls after the war, and on its refusal to share in the after-war financial burdens of our Allies. Mr. Baruch, like Mr. Keynes, suggests that this might have led to a mitigation of the vindictiveness of the terms of reparation; it might also have led to a profound change in the baffled sense of desperation which has undoubtedly been responsible for much of the French post-war diplomacy. But on both of these points American public opinion then and now has been in accord with the course of our representatives at Paris. It will take time for us too to see the light.

L. S. G.

General Booth

The Life of General William Booth, the Founder of the Salvation Army. By Harold Begbie. The Macmillan Company. 2 vols.

WILLIAM BOOTH was born in a dilapidated family which took little interest in religion. Circumstances snatched him from a private academy and put him behind the counter of a pawnbroker. Inner experience—in which the renunciation of a silver pencil, dishonestly acquired, played an important part—there transformed his heart. For a considerable period he divided his activities between being a pawnbroker by day and being a preacher by night. Through the help of a friend, rather than through any sense of the incompatibility of his pursuits, he became a clergyman. But his sincerity and strenuousness found the limitations of ecclesiasticism more unbearable than those of the pawnshop, and he left the churches to set up an independent mission for the submerged of London. "We are moral scavengers, netting the very sewers," he wrote. Of this mission he was "General Superintendent." The masterfulness of his nature

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made his fellow workers drop the noun rather than the adjective, and he was "General" before there was an army. Gradually metaphor was metamorphosed into reality and an army arose to match the General. The chief officers sprang from his own household, multiplied his personality, and confirmed his autocracy. His rise from persecution to popularity was rapid. Only a few years separate virulent attacks upon him by mobs and bishops from interviews with all the rulers of the world and throngs hanging upon his words in vast halls. This most characteristic portion of his career the brave General thus sums up: "My arms are not long enough. I find that when I am in touch with the poor, I lose my hold upon the rich, and when I reach up to the rich, I let go of the poor. I very much doubt whether God Almighty's arms are long enough for this." The period of popularity was broken into by anxieties, disappointments, family misunderstandings, and sore bereavements. The Army's offensive was complicated by problems of the commissariat. The General discovered that salvation reaches into the outer as well as into the inner world. The great evangelist became, of dire necessity, agricultural overseer, colonizer, and diplomat. He was compelled to keep men saving in order to keep them saved. Then he became a world-ambassador and fought old age with immense journeyings, a restricted diet, and never-failing summonses of crowds to penitent benches. Blindness fell upon him. "I have done what I could for God and the people with my eyes," he at once told his son. "Now I shall do what I can for God and the people without my eyes." On dying, he exacted a promise from his son for the homeless and for China, and, smiling over the "bonnie handful" left to do, he fell asleep. When we finish these volumes, we hang his picture on the line—where Paul and Hildebrand and Francis and Luther hang.

He loved the masses—not as pathetic objects but as lost and blameworthy children of God. He did not wish to feed but to restore them. "Kindness without an effort at conversion," he thought, "will do more harm than good." He always heard "the tramp of the multitudes as they march down to the gates of hell." "All you chaps who belong to Nobody, follow me," he always seemed calling. Toward the end of his own journey, his diary records: "Poor night. Turning and twisting for hours with a strange weight at my heart. It is strange how the world's sin and miseries are allowed to pile themselves up in the chambers of the soul."

He had an incomparable intensity of nature. Almost every page of the book seems an illustration of his assertion: "You can only keep company with God by running at full speed." And he had to run on a narrow track. As Mr. Begbie puts it: "For the sake of Christ, he denied his period." On one of his rare trips toward scholarship he wrote in his diary: "Visited the British Museum. Walked up and down there praying that God would enable me to acquire knowledge to increase my usefulness." Indolence was hateful to him. His daughter extracted a promise from him in his old age to lie still until she brought tea. Soon she heard him bustling about. In answer to her reproof he said: "I've been thinking of all the sufferings of little children in the cities and I can't sleep." We even discover him kneeling with Cecil Rhodes in a railway compartment, praying for Rhodes's soul.

Booth was an autocrat, conscious of power and achievement. He boasted that he was general to his own children before he was father. He dared address his missioners thus: "Confidence in God and me are absolutely indispensable now and ever." Again: "I am determined that evangelists must hold my views and work on my lines." He wished this question uppermost among his officers: "What does the General believe and what does the General do?" Even Gladstone was amazed at the autocratic regulations of the Army. He was decidedly self-aware. "The whole human family," he wrote his wife, "are being laid under obligation to us more and more day by day." He even rejoiced that though saved by grace he was to be judged by works.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Begbie has laid us all under immense obligation through the unusual blend of candor, insight, and reverence with which he has limned the picture of this noble soul. And yet we must confess to a feeling of disappointment. At important places the story lacks clarity. The process of Booth's conversion, the details of his break with Methodism, the transition of the mission into the army, the most significant attitude of the General to the Sacraments, are all too insufficiently treated. That the book cannot be regarded as the definitive account of the General is clear because Mr. Begbie has felt it unwise and declares it unnecessary to consider Booth's serious disagreements with his children. How far his undeniable English patriotism and his love of arbitrary authority may have got the better of his concern for the Army cannot be known apart from that controversy. Occasionally his concern for the Army seems to transcend his sympathy for the humanity it was organized to serve. Perhaps the most serious disappointment of all is the paucity of reference to General Booth's immediate touch with the outcast. We miss the bugles and the tears of the Army too much. For them we could have forfeited details of royal audiences and some of the "fine writing" of the first volume. Perhaps Mr. Begbie did not wish to trench on the material covered in "Twice-Born Men," that marvelous work of his which captivated William James.

A. W. Vernon

Persian Literature

A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion (*A. D.* 1265-1502). By Edward G. Browne. Cambridge University Press.

THE literature of Persia has found a most able and enthusiastic interpreter in Professor Edward G. Browne, of the University of Cambridge, who has already published two exhaustive volumes entitled "A Literary History of Persia," bringing the subject down to the middle of the thirteenth century. Now comes a third, covering the period from 1265 to 1502. It is practically a continuation, if not so in name and form, of the other two standard volumes, and takes its place by the side of them as a masterpiece of sound scholarship and critical judgment.

The present book, of nearly six hundred pages, keeps the historic background ever in view and treats with great detail the literary epochs that marked the long period between the renowned Sa'di and the great mystic and lyric poet Jami. The well-known monuments in prose and verse which belong to the different eras, are fully discussed; not only that, but the scope of the work is so far-reaching that some of the out-of-the-way authors presented are not wholly familiar even to the more special student of Persian literature. In fact, in a number of instances they are now made available for the first time through translations directly from manuscripts that are not ordinarily accessible. In these and in other cases the reproduction of the Persian text itself adds materially to the value of the volume.

Persia's famous lyrist, Hafiz, comes in for elaborate consideration in fifty pages, extremely useful information being given also regarding the many translations of this anacreontic poet of Shiraz. Hafiz, it may be noted, lamented in more than one verse when the wine-shops in his native city were closed by an austere ruler of the Province of Fars, but broke forth in a song of rejoicing when strict prohibition was relaxed by that ruler's more lenient successor. It could be wished that so skilled a translator as Professor Browne had added more of his own renderings of the celebrated singer of the nightingale and the rose, but he refrained from so doing, in order to give space to some of the noteworthy versions by others.

Everyone will agree that the author's enthusiastic praise of Jami as "at once a great poet, a great scholar, and a great mystic" is not overdone; the selections given in the last forty pages of the book will abundantly prove the truth of this.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Added value is lent to the work by a dozen photographic reproductions from rare Persian manuscripts as illustrations of the text.

It may interest after-dinner speakers to find, on page 242, that the story of the mouse who accidentally tasted a few drops from a wine-jar and then boldly began to inquire where the accursed cat was, is as old in substance as a Persian poem by Ubayd-i Zakani, who died in 1371! But the English translator has not heard the tale in the form in which it went the rounds of late. Certainly our modern toastmasters could not have imagined that their story had been anticipated in Persia more than five hundred years ago; so, after all, there is something new in the Land of the Lion and the Sun.

A. V. Williams Jackson

A Psychoanalyst of Poetry

Skepticisms. By Conrad Aiken. Alfred A. Knopf.

MR. AIKEN welcomes the decay of judicial criticism as the poet-critic's opportunity. When there is no judge to control the verdict of public opinion, the way lies open for the special pleader; and all creative artists, he tells us in the Apologia Pro Specie Sua prefixed to his collected reviews, are competitors for a favorable verdict, all are consciously or unconsciously engaged in glorifying their own predilections. They must not only create works of art, but secure the acceptance of standards adapted to the nature of their output. Hence when a poet sets out to review the work of his rivals we may watch for the knife under the cloak.

The papers which follow this confession of malice prepense do not disappoint the reader's expectation of pungent comment. As his title implies, Mr. Aiken has his doubts of the widely heralded merits of contemporary poetry. The British product seems to him in the mass thin in substance, the American undistinguished in form. "For the present," he remarks of his lyric countrymen, "the majority of our poets are not so much poets as symptoms." To determine the poetic *malaise* of the moment, accordingly, he listens to each successive volume of verse as the psychoanalyst listens to the soliloquies of the patient. His conclusions are brilliant and keenly reasoned disclosures of the temperamental limitations and mistakes of his poetic colleagues, sometimes tempered at the end with a handsome compliment to the victim's well-known professional ability. In so far as Mr. Aiken's lucid and discriminating opinions may offset the mawkish and meaningless eulogy of "poeteering" journalists, we may be unqualifiedly grateful to him.

He does, however, invite disagreement with his critical principles by announcing them with excessive candor. One might quarrel with Mr. Aiken's view that criticism is a "branch of psychology" on the ground of the age of the one and the youth of the other, but it is more important to note that his psychological bent frequently tempts him to pursue ignoble game. It lures him away from the poetry of Miss Amy Lowell to dash after her prose; it impels him to tree Mr. Braithwaite on two several occasions, and to bring to earth with arrowy sarcasm many a "dawn-twitterer" of sentimental lyrics. His attitude of diagnostician, moreover, leads him to take an abnormal interest in abnormality, so that his book tends to become a catalogue of the weaker qualities of the worst poets. This emphasis on the faulty, perhaps more than the accidents of reviewing, may explain the omission of any extended consideration of Robert Frost and the purely descriptive treatment accorded to John Masefield in Mr. Aiken's pages. With healthy men the physician can do no business. And finally, Mr. Aiken's aesthetic perceptions gain as much and as little by being translated into the semi-scientific jargon of Freud, Pavlov, and Kostylev as Hamlet's soliloquies might if translated into Eskimo.

It is when he forgets to play the amateur psychologist and speaks as a skilful craftsman of his art that Mr. Aiken contributes passages of notable subtlety and depth to contemporary criticism. At his best he is capable of flawless interpretation, even of poetry antithetical to his personal tastes. Nothing in its way could be better than his appreciation of John Gould Fletcher's color symphonies. He calls them ". . . a sort of absolute poetry, a poetry of detached waver and brilliance, a beautiful flowering of language alone, a parthenogenesis, as if language were fertilized by itself rather than by thought or feeling. Remove the magic of phrase and sound, and there is nothing left: no thread of continuity, no relation between one page and the next, no thought, no story, no emotion. But the magic of phrase and sound is powerful, and it takes one into a fantastic world where one is etherialized, where one has deep emotions indeed, but emotions star-powdered, and blown to flame by speed and intensity rather than by thought or human warmth." Though himself temperamentally inclined toward realistic and narrative poetry, poetry of which the appeal is "not merely aesthetic, but intellectual and emotional also—in the richest sense, human," Mr. Aiken is liberal and catholic in his appreciation of poems in the decorative and lyric tradition. Except when he leans violently toward the absolute in art to counterbalance Mr. Untermeyer's inclination toward the sociological, he rarely sways from the true critical perpendicular. And this momentary loss of poise is a matter of practice rather than of theory: all that the robust Mr. Untermeyer urges us to admire in poetry might be included in Mr. Aiken's definition (given in a calmer moment): ". . . . poetry to be poetry must after all rise above a mere efficiency of charmingness, or efficiency of accuracy, to this sort of piercing perfection of beauty or truth, phrased in piercing perfection of music."

George F. Whicher

Susan Glaspell

Plays. By Susan Glaspell. Small, Maynard and Company.

IN the rude little auditorium of the Provincetown Players on MacDougall Street there is an iron ring in the wall, and a legend informs you that the ring was designed for the tethering of Pegasus. But the winged horse has never been seen. An occasional play might have allured him; the acting of it would invariably have driven him to indignant flight. For, contrary to what one would expect, the acting of the Players has been not only crude and unequal; it has been without energy, without freshness, without the natural stir and eloquence that come from within. This is the circumstance which has tended to obscure the notable talent of Susan Glaspell. The Washington Square Players produced "Trifles" and thus gave a wide repute to what is by no means her best work. "Bernice," not only her masterpiece but one of the indisputably important dramas of the modern English or American theater, was again played by the Provincetown Players with more than their accustomed feebleness and lack of artistic lucidity. The publication of Miss Glaspell's collected plays at last lifts them out of the tawdriness of their original production and lets them live by their own inherent life.

That life is strong, though it is never rich. In truth, it is thin. Only it is thin not like a wisp of straw, but like a tongue of flame. Miss Glaspell is morbidly frugal in expression, but nakedly candid in substance. There are no terrors for her in the world of thought; she thinks her way clearly and hardily through a problem and always thinks in strictly dramatic terms. But her form and, more specifically, her dialogue, have something of the helplessness and the numb pathos of the "twisted things that grow in unfavoring places" which employ her imagination. She is a dramatist, but a dramatist who is a little afraid of speech. Her dialogue is so spare that it often becomes arid; at times, as in "The Outside," her attempt to lend a stunted utterance to her silenced creatures makes for a hopeless obscurity. The bleak farmsteads of Iowa, the stagnant villages

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of New England, have touched her work with penury and chill. She wants to speak out and to let her people speak out. But neither she nor they can conquer a sense that free and intimate and vigorous expression is a little shameless. To uncover one's soul seems almost like uncovering one's body. Behind Miss Glaspell's hardihood of thought hover the fear and self-torment of the Puritan. She is a modern radical and a New England school teacher; she is a woman of intrepid thought and also the cramped and aproned wife on some Iowa farm. She is a composite, and that composite is intensely American. She is never quite spontaneous and unconscious and free, never the unquestioning servant of her art. She broods and tortures herself and weighs the issues of expression.

If this view of Miss Glaspell's literary character is correct, it may seem strange upon superficial consideration that four of her seven one-act plays are comedies. But two of them, the rather trivial "Suppressed Desires" and the quite brilliant "Tickless Time," were written in collaboration with George Cram Cook, a far less scrupulous and more ungirdled mind. Her comedy, furthermore, is never hearty. It is not the comedy of character but of ideas, or, rather, of the confusion or falseness or absurdity of ideas. "Woman's Honor" is the best example of her art in this mood. By a sound and strictly dramatic if somewhat too geometrical device, Miss Glaspell dramatizes a very searching ironic idea: a man who refuses to establish an alibi in order to save a woman's honor dies to prove her possessed of what he himself has taken and risks everything to demonstrate the existence of what has ceased to be. The one-act tragedies are more characteristic of her; they cleave deep, but they also illustrate what one might almost call her taciturnity. That is the fault of her best-known piece, "Trifles." The theme is magnificent; it is inherently and intensely dramatic, since its very nature is culmination and crisis. But the actual speech of the plan is neither sufficient nor sufficiently direct. Somewhere in every drama words must ring out. They need not ring like trumpets. The ring need not be loud, but it must be clear. Suppose in "Trifles" you do not, on the stage, catch the precise significance of the glances which the neighbor women exchange. There need have been no set speech, no false eloquence, no heightening of what these very women might easily have said in their own persons. But one aches for a word to release the dumbness, complete the crisis, and drive the tragic situation home.

The same criticism may be made, though in a lesser degree, of Miss Glaspell's single full-length play, "Bernice." No production would be just to the very high merits of that piece which did not add several speeches to the first and third acts and give these the spiritual and dramatic clearness which the second already has. Crude people will call the play "talky." But indeed there is not quite talk enough. Nor does Miss Glaspell deal here with simple and stifled souls. That objection is the only one to be made. The modern American drama has nothing better to show than Miss Glaspell's portrait of the "glib and empty" writer whose skill was "a mask for his lack of power" and whose wife sought, even as she died, to lend him that power through the sudden impact of a supremely tragic reality. The surface of the play is delicate and hushed. But beneath the surface is the intense struggle of rending forces. Bernice is dead. The soft radiance of her spirit is still upon the house. It is still reflected in her father's ways and words. Her husband and her friend hasten to that house. And now the drama sets in, the drama that grows from Bernice's last words to her old servant. It is a dramatic action that moves and stirs and transforms. There is hardly the waving of a curtain in those quiet rooms. Yet the dying woman's words are seen to have been a creative and dramatic act. Through a bright, hard window one watches people in a house of mourning. They stand or sit and talk haltingly as people do at such times. Nothing is done. Yet everything happens—death and life and a new birth. What more can drama give?

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

An Elder America

The Age of Innocence. By Edith Wharton. D. Appleton and Company.

The Vacation of the Kelwyns. By William Dean Howells. Harper and Brothers.

WE can no more do without some notion or other of an age more golden than our own than we can do without bread. There must be, we assure ourselves, a more delectable day yet to come, or there must have been one once. The evidence of prophecy, however, is stronger than that of history, which, somehow, fails to find the perfect age. Mrs. Wharton has never ranged herself with the prophets, contented, apparently, with being the most intellectual of our novelists and surveying with level, satirical eyes the very visible world. By the "Age of Innocence" she means the seventies in New York during the past century; and the innocence she finds there is "the innocence that seals the mind against imagination and the heart against experience." To the hotter attacks which angrier critics have recently been making upon that age she does not lend herself. Her language is cool and suave. And yet the effect of her picture is an unsparing accusation of that genteel decade when the van der Luydens of Skuytercliff were the ultimate arbiters of "form" in Manhattan, and "form" was occupation and religion for the little aristocracy which still held its tight fortress in the shaggy city so soon about to overwhelm it. The imminence of the rising tide is never quite indicated. How could it be, when the characters of the action themselves do not see it, bound up as they are with walking their wintry paths and hugging their iron taboos? Newland Archer suspects a change, but that is because he is a victim of the tribal order which sentences him to a life without passion, without expression, without satisfaction. The Countess Olenska suspects it, but she too is a victim, too fine for the rougher give-and-take of her husband's careless European society and yet not conventional enough for the dull routine which in her native New York covers the fineness to which also she is native. The peculiar tragedy of their sacrifice is that it is for the sake of a person, Archer's wife, who is virtuous because she is incapable of temptation, competent because she is incapable of any deep perturbation, and willing to suit herself to the least decorum of their world because she is incapable of understanding that there is anywhere anything larger or freer. The unimaginative not only miss the flower of life themselves but they shut others from it as well.

Mrs. Wharton's structure and methods show no influence of the impressionism now broadening the channel of fiction; she does not avoid one or two touches of the florid in her impassioned scenes; she rounds out her story with a reminiscent chapter which forces in the note of elegy where it only partially belongs. But "The Age of Innocence" is a masterly achievement. In lonely contrast to almost all the novelists who write about fashionable New York, she knows her world. In lonely contrast to the many who write about what they know without understanding it or interpreting it, she brings a superbly critical disposition to arrange her knowledge in significant forms. These characters who move with such precision and veracity through the ritual of a frozen caste are here as real as their actual lives would ever have let them be. They are stiff with ceremonial garments and heavy with the weight of imagined responsibilities. Mrs. Wharton's triumph is that she has described these rites and surfaces and burdens as familiarly as if she loved them and as lucidly as if she hated them.

"The Vacation of the Kelwyns," a novel written by William Dean Howells about 1910 but for unannounced reasons not then published, also turns back to the idyllic seventies, when Professor Kelwyn and his family went from a New England college to spend the summer in a house rented by them from a Shaker community and run for them by a pair of rustics so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impossible in customs and manners that they have to be discharged. To the task of discharging them the Kelwyns's entire vacation is devoted. About this trivial theme play all the warmth and grace and gentleness which marked the later Howells. But here is more than farce and timid hesitancy: here is a document upon that pastoral age. Genteel New England, no less than genteel New York, stood on precarious foundations. Democracy menaced it. In a thoroughly aristocratic society the impossible Kites could have been discharged in a sentence; in a thoroughly democratic society there could have been some meeting of the different minds, and a mutual adjustment. In the half-and-half society of the seventies there was nothing to do but twist and turn and hint and hope.

C. V. D.

Books in Brief

H. DENNIS BRADLEY'S "Not For Fools" (London: Grant Richards) began as a series of newspaper articles written during the war. Mr. Bradley is a business man in London whose business was decided to be essential, and so he was not called upon for military service. Instead of greeting this immunity with grateful silence he made it an opportunity to attack the government with great vigor, and particularly those departments having to do with expenditures and propaganda. At first no newspaper would print his denunciations, and he had to insert them as paid advertisements, but after awhile he became a welcome contributor to many journals and gathered a large following. Of course it is not news today that money was wasted idiotically during the war, and that free speech was abrogated, and that the old men who could not fight were a great deal more eager for the slaughter than the young men who could and had to. But when Mr. Bradley first enunciated these propositions they were less obvious and a good deal more shocking. Unluckily, his genuine success as a critic of official stupidity and dishonesty filled him with a considerable admiration for himself as a brilliant and unfettered thinker, and so he embellishes his war papers with specimens of his ratiocination in other fields. A specimen epigram: "My only objection to business is that it interferes with pleasure." Another: "The average musical comedy is an unmusical tragedy of stupidity and cupidity." The book, rather oddly, is illustrated with excellent designs in color by Rilette and Jacques D'Or.

A MASS of useful data for the student of Italian literature or the lover of the drama is collected between the covers of "Goldoni and the Venice of his Time" (Macmillan), by Joseph Spencer Kennard. After briefly sketching the history of Italian comedy before Goldoni and tracing to their probable origins the characters and masks of his plays, the author takes up the life of the playwright; then, in the final half of the study, the comedies are discussed and the evolution of plots and characters set forth; until the reader comes to realize how Goldoni gathered the threads of the past, the golden thread of classical comedy and the coarser homespun of the commedia dell' arte, in order to mingle them and prepare the woof for modern comedy. It is a painstaking, if somewhat loosely discursive production, documented with footnotes and a bibliography which is the best evidence of the attraction scholars everywhere have felt toward the amiable Carlo; grouped around his portrait the author has placed the portraits of all his friends and foes. Of course, some of this discursiveness was needed to correct the Memoirs, written, like Goldoni's letters and prefaces, with all the actor's regard to his audience, and present to us the real Goldoni in his prosaic but lovable simplicity. Certainly, to know the playwright through his biography and his comedies is to know Goldoni's Venice, for rarely if ever has an author so clearly mirrored in deeds and works the thought, the atmosphere, the very soul of his environment.

BRENTANO'S

Retail Book Department

Fifth Avenue and 27th Street, New York City

BOOKS ON PRESENT DAY TOPICS

Problems of Today
By Moorfield Storey $1.50
In this timely book, Mr. Storey brings his long experience with affairs and keen analytic mind to the study of such pressing topics as the Use of Parties, Lawlessness, Racial Prejudices, the Labor Question, and Our Foreign Relations. He writes always with penetration, lucidity, and a wealth of illustration, and from a point of view at once progressive and well balanced.

Chaos and Order in Industry
By G. D. H. Cole $2.75
Mr. Cole does not pretend that industry is a problem that can be isolated from the whole question of social structure. In so far as he has so treated it it has been purely for the purpose of stimulating discussion. The book as a whole is constructive and points the way to what the author considers a far better and more efficient social and industrial system.

Labor's Crisis: An Employer's View of Labor Problems
By Sigmund Mendelsohn $1.50
The question of labor reform is taken up by this employer from the employer's point of view. He analyzes labor's propositions to remedy the existing unrest, argues that the labor scarcity is not entirely due to decrease in the number of laborers, and suggests many effects of the unrest itself on production and on labor. It is a thoughtful study by a keen, open-minded employer, contributing to one of the most important discussions of the day.

A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain
By Sidney and Beatrice Webb $4.25
What is here presented is more than a Constitution (though as a practicable and characteristically British scheme for Parliamentary and Local Government reform it may receive the attention of statesmen and students). It is more even than a fully worked-out plan for Nationalization and Municipalization, with "workers' control." With its proposals for the development of the Cooperative Movement, for the reorganization of the Vocational World, and for the coordination of all factors, from the Crown to the Works Committee, it sets forth a complete Socialist Commonwealth.

The New World
By Frank Comerford $2.00
Frank Comerford made a searching study of unrest in Europe from Ireland to the Bolshevik Front. Upon his return he was special prosecutor for the State of Illinois in the celebrated Red cases in which twenty men were found guilty of conspiring to overthrow the Government and sentenced to the penitentiary. Mr. Comerford trailed unrest in Europe and America and literally interviewed the specter which is menacingly hanging over the world. He has given voice to the mass mind of a brooding world. It is a great human document, in which the truth thrills the reader.

Postage Additional

BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD

BRENTANO'S

Retail Book Department

Fifth Avenue and 27th Street

New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEAVING the radicals to Mr. Palmer, the steel workers to Judge Gary, and the Negroes to the lynching parties, Henry Seidel Canby studies the virtues and shortcomings of "Everyday Americans" (Century). This group comprises the comfortable middle-class "old" Americans, of at least high-school education, who would certainly agree with Mr. Canby that "the hope of the founders to establish a stable and prosperous republican government where life, property, conscience, and opinion were safe has been realized." So it has, for them. Everyday Americans are not so addicted to the free exercise of their minds as to run any risk of arrest for heretical opinions. They are too busy reading the great national advertising weekly. "Conservative liberals" in their thinking, they are often radical in business and philanthropic enterprise. Physical and moral radicals Mr. Canby calls the great business organizers who ruthlessly scrap old machinery and the philanthropists who uplift millions by destroying the hook-worm or the saloon. But intellectual radicals are rare. Our liberalism—an admirable eighteenth century product—is cherished largely as a tradition. Our education provides us with a set of ideals "like a row of preserved vegetables canned and hermetically sealed for future contingencies." We rather fear to take off the lids; the contents may have "worked." Our political and economic thinking is a museum of what John Stuart Mill called dead beliefs—beliefs we profess but do not practice. And the stagnation and inertia of our traditional liberalism: "its blindness to the new waves of freedom sweeping upward from the masses and on in broken and muddy torrents through the world are poignant dangers."

HARVARD plans no second Memorial Hall to commemorate the death of her sons in the Great War. But as enduring, as valuable, and more telling are the "Memoirs of the Harvard Dead in the War Against Germany" (Harvard University Press) by M. A. DeWolfe Howe. These volumes leave to unknowing posterity no mere names chiseled in stone, but a complete picture of each of the young men who gave their lives. The first volume, "The Vanguard," includes thirty biographies of those who died before April, 1917, "who held with their blood the pledge of the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the Allies which in time was to make our country an active participant in the fight." The stories are simply told. Their fullness varies with the material supplied by friends and family. Each has its appeal, each its rich emotional chord, that of Harry Gustav Byng striking a shade deeper than the rest. But the book amply fulfills the hope of an offering that is worthy and that will carry its message to the sons of sons.

Art

Our National Print Room

THE Print Room at the Library of Congress has never yet been appreciated as it deserves. In spaciousness, proportions, lighting, arrangements for exhibition and for students, few can compete with it. Berlin and Vienna have nothing so fine, nor has Paris in the Cabinet des Estampes at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Even the new Print Room in the British Museum is far from being so well planned and equipped for practical use. It is true that, on the other hand, older Print Rooms contain treasures that Washington cannot boast, and that their collections are apt to be more complete in the work of certain artists and certain periods. But Washington has not had their chances; it is still too young in comparison; and this is the very reason why more should be known of what it has done and what it is doing. Generous American collectors hitherto have preferred to lavish their generosity on local museums and galleries. If they realized the great beginning at Washington and the opportunities offered, they might make it their ambition and pride to fill up the gaps left by inadequate government appropriations and to see that our National Print Room, in its possessions as in its architecture, becomes as important as any of the much older collections of Europe.

The exhibition now on display at Washington is particularly helpful in showing what is being done, for it is devoted to recent accessions. It does not pretend to share the historical or technical aim of those exhibitions arranged of late by Mr. Weitenkampf in the New York Public Library which have proved of so much interest to artists, students, and collectors. The Washington Print Room is a national institution and has a national duty to perform. It must let the people of the country, who are its real owners, see from time to time what it has acquired for them by purchase or gift or by the tax imposed by the law of copyright upon the publisher. Unless this fact is remembered, the first impression might be a trifle disconcerting. One passes with something of a shock from a sixteenth century wood block to a contemporary colored aquatint, or from an eighteenth century line engraving to a Cubist lithograph, or from the big war lithographs to proofs of the little drawings on wood made by Whistler in the sixties. There is no attempt at definite sequence or chronological order in the arrangement, no division of prints into classes according to mediums, though such an arrangement would have been more suggestive technically. The endeavor has been rather to place the prints to the best advantage in the cases and to space and balance them so that they can be seen with the greatest degree of comfort and pleasure. In this the exhibition is altogether successful. Again, had the object been to show only the finest prints, more than one now included would have been omitted. But others besides the finest prints have their use in a national collection, and a glance at the last catalogue of the Print Room compiled before these recent acquisitions might explain the presence of many of the less important. The main interest, however, is not so much in the prints considered individually as in the policy that evidently guided their selection.

There is hardly a Print Room that is not the poorer because it failed to acquire certain prints when the artist produced them and they could be had for a sum within the reach of the thriftiest government—and most governments have a way of growing thrifty when it is a question of art. Of course, some prints whose price is today prohibitive, if they can be had at all, were made in years when there were no Print Rooms to store them in. But some, sold today for fabulous figures, could have been obtained no longer ago than yesterday for the proverbial song. Curators and directors, however, are sometimes timid, distrustful of their own judgment, and fearful of criticism, and they miss their chance. In this connection the names of Whistler and the now overesteemed Meryon will at once leap to the mind of all who know anything about prints. It is another thing with those etchers of our own times whose fantastic fame and extravagant prices have been manufactured deliberately by dealers and in the auction room, their etchings floated like so much oil or mining stock. It is just because the price their work fetches gives them an artificial prominence that their contemporaries are fought shy of by the average private or public collector who has neither knowledge of art nor genuine feeling for it, but who makes cost his criterion. In the Library of Congress Print Room, fortunately, the effort is to avoid all such artificial values and distinctions. Even though the wise tendency is to acquire modern work, the older work is by no means neglected, and it is likely that, if there are gaps, it is because the prices of much-needed examples soared too far above the Print Room's purse. But it is clear that great attention is given to the work of men still living or who died only yesterday—men like the French Buhot, Bracquemond, Jacquemart, the British Spencer-Pryse, Shannon, McBey, the American Platt, Pennell, MacLaughlan. Mistakes may have been made and, here and there, a print chosen might better be dispensed with now and forevermore. But the tendency to acquire modern work is in the right direction.

N. N.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The Doctrine of the Natural Frontiers of France

By JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

"MAN," once wrote Robert Louis Stevenson, "shall not live by bread alone, but principally by catch-words." Every great nation has some traditional and unwritten law which it has continually invoked, and which has profoundly influenced its history. With Great Britain it is the "sovereignty of the sea"; with the United States it is the Monroe Doctrine; in the history of France for centuries the cry has been "natural frontiers," i.e., the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees.

This doctrine has had profound influence upon the political policy and the territorial expansion of France, both in medieval and in modern times, especially during the reign of Louis XIV, the period of the Directory, the Napoleonic era, and under the Second Empire. It is the root of the Alsace-Lorraine question. French publicists have long recognized and clearly formulated the nature and principles of this doctrine although the import and influence of it have been curiously ignored or misunderstood outside of France. The declaration of the French Government on September 18, 1917, concerning the French recovery of Alsace-Lorraine asserted: "No enemy maneuver, no individual weakness, can turn France from her unshakable determination. That determination she draws from the purest traditions of our race." Since the armistice of November 11, 1918, French imperialists have stretched this "pure tradition" to the old dimensions of the ambition of Louis XIV and Napoleon, and have boldly claimed for France the whole left bank of the Rhine. On December 9, 1918, one of the imperialist deputies announced: "The Rhine is the true frontier of Gaul—Caesar said so." That this imperialist program is advocated by the French military party and by Marshal Foch admits of no doubt.

In the light of recent history it seems worth while to trace the origin, genesis, development, and application of this doctrine of natural frontiers.

Three men of destiny, who lived almost equidistant from one another, have profoundly influenced the history of France—Caesar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon. But the national tradition of France was not influenced by these three great leaders in the chronological order in which each appeared in history. The order of their influence is Charlemagne, Caesar, and Napoleon.

From the time of Philip Augustus to Napoleon, Charlemagne has haunted the imagination of France. "It is in the deeds of the great emperor," says Sorel, "that one must find the earliest origin of a political tradition which, by a strange atavism, was destined in the nineteenth century, before the frightened eyes of Europe, to realize that prodigious western empire which the medieval poets had represented as a marvelous legend to popular imagination." When Napoleon was crowned French emperor it was not an act of vainglory on his part, but one in harmony with the whole drift of French political thought and French political aspirations for centuries past.

Under Philip the Fair the Charlemagnic tradition acquired new force and new extension. Pierre Du Bois, a French legist whose mind was saturated with the popular poetry of the crusading epoch, and who accepted the deeds of Charlemagne related in the chansons as actual history, wrote a famous tract in which he passionately advocated French territorial aggrandizement. The Rhinelands and Italy, in his mind, ought to be provinces of a Greater France, such as Charlemagne's empire had once been. Charlemagne had held sway over those lands. Why not the king of France? The kings of France were the lawful heirs of the imperial Frankish dynasty; the Hapsburgs were usurpers and pretenders. Anticipating by five hundred years the secularizations of the Treaty of Westphalia and of Napoleon in Germany in 1801, Du Bois argued that those German nobles who would be dispossessed by the establishment of French domination on the left bank of the Rhine might be compensated by secularization of the lands of the church in Germany.

No fact is more significant of French designs upon German and imperial territory at this time than the history of the apocryphal treaty of Vaucouleurs, reputed to have been signed in 1299 between Philip IV and Albert of Hapsburg, in which the German sovereign is alleged to have admitted the legitimacy of French claims to the Rhine. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century the legend was still current that a bronze marking-post might be seen in the Rhine at low-water, which was a monument of that delimitation.

After the days of Jeanne d'Arc and the French national recovery there was a renascence of the long-eclipsed tradition of national aspiration and territorial aggrandizement of which Philip the Fair had been the founder. The *guerre des limites* began again. In 1444, at the inception of his expedition to conquer Lorraine, Charles VII summoned the cities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun to recognize French rule *"qui d'ecienneté souloient estre et appartenir à noz predecesseurs roys de France."* In the same year he unsuccessfully attempted to conquer Alsace.

It matters little that this expedition failed of achievement. The French monarchy is an admirable example of the principle of line upon line, precept upon precept. Time, a king of France once said, ripened events like peaches in the sun.

In the "Debate between the Heralds of France and England," written between 1453 and 1461, we have even more striking evidence as to the influence of the Charlemagnic legend and the conquering aspirations of France. The French herald says:

> Charlemagne was a noble king and performed great acts of valor, especially against the Saracens; and he brought over all the Spains to the Catholic faith, and conquered many lordships, both in Germany and Lombardy. . . . The same Charlemagne was afterwards emperor, and you yourselves in England were subject to him. For his great acts of valor he is placed in the number of the Nine Worthies. Roland and Oliver, who performed so many valiant and memorable feats against the Saracens, were Frenchmen. Godfrey de Bouillon, who conquered Jerusalem and is one of the Nine Worthies, was a native of France, and count of Boulogne. These are what I call *wars of great magnificence and honor*, which well deserve to be related, and to form the subject of chronicles. They are *not wars compelled by necessity*. I pass lightly over the common wars which the French have made against the Germans and their other neighbors, and which it would be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tedious to relate; since in the romances and chronicles there are wonderful accounts of them, and such *common wars are not to be mentioned* or chronicled with wars of magnificence.

The dream of Charles VII became the reality of Henry II in 1552, when the Three Bishoprics were wrested from the hand of Charles V. This famous acquisition was regarded by France in the sixteenth century as a just step in the realization of her natural frontiers.

For in this century we find the first definite formulation of this political doctrine. Even in the Middle Ages, though the influence of the Charlemagnic legend had been of far greater weight in motivating the territorial aspirations of the kings of France, the idea of natural frontiers had not been without force. Honorius of Autun, who lived in the twelfth century, in the "Imago Mundi" had bounded Germany by the Rhine, the Alps, and the Elbe, and France by the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees.

The classical renaissance out of Italy added new significance to this doctrine of natural frontiers. Had not Caesar written that all Gaul was divided into three parts, between the Celts, the Aquitani, and the Belgae, the last of whom were nearest the Germans who dwelt *beyond* the Rhine? Strabo's Geography was made to buttress Caesar's Commentaries. The argument for the natural frontiers of France was justified by imperial Roman history as well as by Carolingian imperial history. "The Commentaries," says Sorel, "which were the admiration of the literati became the breviary of the politicians. The kings and their legists took from the Romans the ideas of the frontier of Gaul as they had taken the precepts of public law from them. . . . It was a war of citations and of syllogisms, in which the subtleties of the Digest were combined with the quibbles of scholasticism, geography and astrology, history and legend, Caesar's Commentaries and the deeds of Charlemagne, the Theodosian Code and the laws of the barbarians, the precedents of the Roman Empire and the charters of the Middle Ages."

Henry II was urged to seize the whole left bank of the Rhine and not alone the Three Bishoprics. It was plausibly argued that France might exact "recompenses" and "satisfactions" for her intervention. The Marshal Vieilleville, arguing for the French conquest even of German Lorraine, said to the king: "By so doing your Majesty will win about forty leagues of territory without losing a man, and have an impregnable rampart for the protection of Champagne and Picardy, besides a good road always open for the acquisition of Luxemburg and the countries below it down to Brussels." The French chauvinists in 1552 were bitterly disappointed that the king had not seized the whole left bank of the Rhine when he might have done so.

Fifty years later, when Henry IV seized Bresse and Bugey, i.e., both banks of the upper Rhone as far as the Lake of Geneva, his minister, the Duke de Sully, remonstrated with him when the king declared that identity of language was the most just and almost the only ground of territorial annexation. In an age when dynastic claims were given all weight, and when the rights of the people were lightly regarded by the cabinets of Europe, this utterance of Henry of Navarre shines like generous recognition of a just social principle in a world of military force and diplomatic intrigue. Sully was an ardent advocate of the idea of natural frontiers, and counted off upon his fingers, to his sovereign, a magnificent list of possible territorial acquisitions France might make, enumerating Alsace, Lorraine, Savoy, Franche Comté, Artois, Hainaut, the Spanish Netherlands, Luxemburg, and even Cleves and Jülich as rightful "spheres" of French influence.

Richelieu had not the scruples of Henry IV, and the doctrine of natural frontiers in his time became a prolific source of French aggrandizement. In 1627 Malherbe wrote a memoir which attracted the cardinal's attention, in which he said: "The region between the Rhine and the Pyrenees is none too large for the fleur de lys." In 1633 Richelieu addressed a memoir to Louis XIII of his own writing, in which he advocated French intervention in Germany in favor of the protestants, because "it would extend his kingdom as far as the Rhine without striking a blow," and argued that the German princes could be made to put "everything which they possess on this side of the Rhine into the king's hands as the recompense of his services." Further, the cardinal ordered one of his counsellors to prepare a memoir in which the French doctrine of natural frontiers was elaborately set forth with all the weight behind it of Roman and Carolingian history, dynastic claims, and legalistic arguments. By 1640 Richelieu had routed the ancient enemy of the house of Hapsburg on every frontier, Alsace and Lorraine were occupied by French troops, even part of the bend of the Rhine was in France's possession. The natural frontiers of France had been expanded.

In the very last year of his life Richelieu caused another memoir to be published embodying the same familiar arguments of natural frontiers, and invoking the legend of Charlemagne and the authority of Julius Caesar. It was followed in 1643 by "An Inquiry into the Rights of the King and Crown of France over the Kingdoms, Duchies, Counties, Towns, and Countries Occupied by Foreign Princes." One has but to read the arguments in these pamphlets to realize how intensely popular and national the *guerre des limites* had become by the middle of the seventeenth century. The wars of Louis XIV have here their raison d'être. Although the pretexts or the claims of those wars were dynastic or based on technical legalities, as wars they harmonized with the territorial aspirations of the French people.

Mazarin, like Richelieu, was imbued with the idea of France's natural frontiers. Condé's victory at Rocroy in 1643 fixed French hold firmly on Lorraine, while Turenne overran Alsace. The two captains together then captured Philipsburg, Mannheim, Speyer, Worms, Oppenheim, and Landau. Turenne boasted that he had "returned the Rhine to its former masters."

Louis XIV was more fertile in discovering pretexts, more ingenious in finding pretensions for territorial aggrandizement than Richelieu and Mazarin had been. But if the means somewhat changed, the purpose remained constant. The persistency of French determination, the constancy of French design had its sanction in the deeply rooted determinism of the traditional doctrine of France's frontiers. Louis XIV justified the seizure of Alsace on the ground that it was "good to unite to the body of the monarchy an ancient patrimony of our forefathers which had long been separated," although the theory was untenable except upon the hypothesis that Caesar's Gaul and Charlemagne's empire had been a "greater France." When he acquired Franche Comté in 1678 the king wrote in his Memoirs: "It is a grand province, fertile, important, which by language and law now, as in former times, ought to form a part of the realm of France."

No man ever more adroitly manipulated the public law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Europe for territorial aggrandizement than did Louis XIV. Voltaire said of the territorial seizures practiced under the euphemism of "reunion," that Louis XIV made peace a time of conquest. In theory France's seizure of Saarburg, Saarlouis, Pont-à-Mousson, Germersheim, Falkenberg, Zweibrücken, Blamont, Montbéliard, Colmar Schlettstadt, Landau, and Strasbourg were just "revindications" in order to restore "greater France." The same theory was used to justify Louis XIV's seizure of the Palatinate and the whole bend of the Rhine, in spite of the fact that the population there was wholly German in blood and language.

When an outraged Europe finally combined against the territorial aggressions of France and defeated the French armies, nevertheless Louis XIV was able still to retain much of the left bank of the Rhine, though half beaten. "France is not always modest in the hour of victory," a living English historian has written, "but however crushing her defeat, she professes an imprescriptible claim to territory which she has once possessed."

Even the gulf of the French Revolution could not break the continuity of the Bourbon doctrine of France's natural frontiers. As the Reformation and the chambers of reunion had earlier been used to further the ends of French territorial aggrandizement, so in the Revolution the doctrine of the Rights of Man performed the same function. In 1791 the Legislative Assembly renounced wars of conquest. But after Valmy France grew hungry for the Austrian Netherlands, Savoy, and the bend of the Rhine. Rousseau's fortunate allusion to the Rhine and the Alps as "limits traced by nature" justified the change of heart. Gregoire and Danton urged a *guerre des limites*. A decree of the Legislative Assembly in 1792 declared that "the French armies will not lay down their arms until the enemies of the republic have been driven across the Rhine." One of the republican orators affirmed the imprescriptible right of France to annex territories of all peoples whom the "rights of man" ought to redeem. Robespierre, with astonishing inconsistency with the tenets of the revolutionary propaganda, justified French territorial aggrandizement on the same grounds that Frederick the Great had annexed Silesia. The French Revolution, as Sorel has said, manifested itself as a sort of "fierce rejuvenescence of the classic ambition of France." The conquests of Custine and Hoche in the bend of the Rhine in 1792 were of a piece with those of Condé and Turenne.

Never was the war for natural frontiers waged more ardently than in the years 1792-1802. On October 21, 1792, the French under Custine entered Mainz. Two days later "La société des amis allemands de la liberté et de l'égalité" was formed, whom Georges Forster on November 15 addressed in these words: "The Rhine, that great navigable river, is the natural frontier of a great republic which desires no conquest but accepts nations which agree to join it." On March 30, 1793, the Convention proclaimed the new "increase by assimilation."

The military reverses of the summer of 1793, however, overturned things. Again the Rive Gauche was conquered in 1794, after Jourdan's victory of Fleurus; but the Palatinate was not entirely in French power until October, 1795, and the fortress of Mainz was not occupied until December 30, 1797.

The history of the wars of Louis XIV repeated itself too sharply in 1794 for the inhabitants of the Rhineland to indulge in any illusions about "liberty, equality, fraternity" and the blessings of "democracy."[1] The arbitrary contributions imposed by the victorious French armies upon the conquered region, the pillage of homes, farmsteads, vineyards, the wantonness and atrocities of the French soldiery[2] first created dismay and then wrath and terror among the peaceful dwellers of the Palatinate. Goethe has immortalized this mixture of despair and fury of a frightened and outraged German peasantry in "Hermann und Dorothea."

France was little changed at heart by the sentimental catch-phrases of the Revolution. Even Camille Desmoulins advocated a second burning of the Palatinate as punishment for German refusal to receive the principles of the Revolution. Merlin de Thionville, in whom the spirit of Louvois had rebirth, not only approved the ravages of Pichegru's army, but also advocated another destruction of the Palatinate as a means of terrorizing Mainz into surrender. The principle was actually laid down, which Louis XIV had espoused, that France ought to girdle herself with deserts, and "commissioners of evacuation" were even appointed for this purpose.

The fall of the Terror Government on July 27, 1794, and the establishment of the Directory involved no change of military or foreign policy. Siéyès, the maker of the new constitution, had formulated plans of conquest which appealed most subtly to the warlike ardor of the French nation. The left bank of the Rhine was to be annexed; Germany was to be forcibly "reconstructed." It was the dream of which Napoleon was to become the executor.

The war party had clever lawyers to support its views with plausible arguments. They were no whit inferior to the legists of Philip the Fair and the publicists of Louis XIV. Their argument was an ingenious adaptation of the ancient theories of natural frontiers and reunion to the new conditions and the new doctrines of the "rights of man" and popular sovereignty promulgated by the Revolution. They distinguished between territorial annexation by aggrandizement (*accroissement par agglomération*) and territorial annexation by assimilation (*accroissement par assimilation*). The former policy was stigmatized as the infamous policy of monarchical and autocratic despoilers like Frederick the Great in the case of Silesia (they forgot that Robespierre had justified Frederick), and the trinity of despotism which had partitioned Poland. But "assimilation" was in entire harmony with the principles of the Revolution; it was an extension of liberty and popular sovereignty to peoples living unwillingly under the abuses of absolutism.

The policy of the Directory was aggressively to push the theory of natural frontiers. Victorious warfare was the only method which the decrepit and corrupt Directory could use to keep itself in power, and the cry of the natural frontiers for France became a slogan to cover a war for territorial aggrandizement, with the prostitution of the real principles of the Revolution, under the guise of making a "crusade for democracy." With this purpose was joined the purpose of rehabilitating the dilapidated finances of France by exacting exorbitant terms of peace, and imposing

[1] ". . . The imported 'fraternity' turned into brutal arrogance, 'equality' into oppression, 'liberty' into unwilling annexation."—Herbst, *Heinrich Voss*, Leipzig, 1872, II, 109.

[2] In five years these impositions amounted to 150,000,000 francs.—Fisher, *Napoleonic Statesmanship in Germany*, 352. Rose, *Nationality in mod. Europe*, 37. For a frank admission of this by a French commander, see *Mémoires* of Dumouriez, ed. Barrière, II, 1 f., 113-15. Friedrich Leopold, Graf zu Stolberg, the poet, wrote a poem in condemnation of the French atrocities, called "Die West-Hunnen." See his *Oden, Lieder, und Balladen*, II, 119-22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous indemnities upon the conquered in event of victorious war. The generals of the armies of France were capitalized. Pichegru was valued at 100 millions, Tourdain and Moreau at 72 millions, Bonaparte at 25 millions in August, 1795.

Among the first acts of the Directory was approval of a decree of the Convention made on October 1, 1795, based upon a long report which had been presented the day previous, which affirmed that the Rhine was the natural frontier of France. Like all governments the Directory invoked the ancient tradition. "We must consummate the salutary work begun at Westphalia," it said, "which remains unfinished." It was just and necessary that a nation like France should be at least as great as Prussia, Austria, and Russia, who "in the system of Europe had anticipated the equivalents which France should have." Cambacérès, Dubois-Crancé, Merlin de Douai, Boissy d'Anglais, and Siéyès were ardent partisans of the doctrine of natural frontiers.

The history of the Directory is one of the most notable chapters in French history, both for formulation of political theory and for action in the matter of France's alleged natural frontiers. At the Congress of Rastadt, "after proclaiming for six years that the Rhine was the natural boundary of France, the French Government discovered that a river cannot be made a military frontier at all. Of what service, urged the French plenipotentiaries, were Strasbourg and Mainz so long as they were commanded by the guns on the opposite bank? If the Rhine was to be of any use to France, France must be put in possession of Kehl and Castel upon the German side."

Of a piece with its handling of the Rhinelands was the Directory's treatment of Switzerland. In 1797 France annexed Mülhausen and Basel as part of the Rhinelands, and Geneva, because the Lake of Geneva was the source of a French river. Invasion of the interior of Switzerland soon followed. Berne was entered by French troops on March 6, 1798. "The treasure of Berne, amounting to about £800,000, accumulated by ages of thrift and good management, was seized in order to provide for Bonaparte's next campaign, and for a host of voracious soldiers and contractors."

The achievements of Napoleon, in germ, are almost all to be found in the idea of natural frontiers for France. Napoleon's famous rejoinder to the Allies in the spring of 1814, when he stood at bay in Champagne, "Not an inch of territory," had its root in France's ancient tradition. The sting to France in the alliance formed by the Powers on March 1, 1814, at Chaumont, pledging themselves not to make peace with Napoleon until France was again reduced to the boundaries of 1791, was that it pricked the pride of France in its tenderest spot—namely, France's natural frontiers.

In 1840 the Eastern question was precipitated anew, and the recoil from that issue revived all the ancient aspirations of France for the Rhine. The storm passed, but while it lasted it had fanned into flame again the ancient fires of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era. The thought of "revenge for 1815" inspired France, and the cry of public speakers and balladists was "On to the Rhine." One knows how maladroitly Napoleon III made war while he professed to be an advocate of peace and how Nice and Savoy were annexed by France by right of natural frontiers. Napoleon III's aspiration to acquire Luxemburg was in alignment with the traditional policy of France since the days of Louis XIV and before. Sully had told Henry IV that the territory was a "natural" part of France, but Napoleon III tried to acquire by intrigue what Louis XIV had seized by force of arms.

It was a typical intrigue of the Second Empire. The French invasion of Belgium was actually considered. The emperor suspected an entente between Belgium and Prussia. It was toward England, however, and not Prussia, that Belgium looked. The Belgian Prime Minister, Frère-Orban, went to Paris in order to pacify the emperor, but resolved not to compromise the neutrality of his country. In order to give the impression that France had not been completely rebuffed, the creation of a mixed commission was proposed. The real purpose of the French Government, as the documents published by M. Hymans show, was to profit by the occasion to compel Belgium to sign a treaty of alliance with France. It was, in fact, a part of Napoleon III's plan for a system of general alliances against Prussia. But Frère-Orban avoided the trap by asserting that the alliance would be a violation of Belgian neutrality, which was guaranteed by the five great Powers.

Napoleon III attributed his discomfiture to Bismarck, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was the attitude of England which was the governing factor. This resentment was aggravated by the question of the Spanish succession in the same year, in which Prussia was pitted against France, and which was the immediate occasion of the Franco-Prussian War. The French emperor's purpose in that conflict was not merely to rehabilitate his injured prestige, and to humiliate Prussia. It was also to get the Rhine frontier.

History never repeats itself. But history is largely a business of endeavoring to put new wine into old bottles; the record of old aspirations, strivings, and victory under a new name; of changing the coin, but not the coinage. If Lord Morley's Recollections have been translated into French it would be well for that school of French imperialists who still clamor for *la rive gauche du Rhin* to reflect upon those eloquent words on the last page of the second volume, in which he deplores the disastrous influence of "grand abstract catch-words veiling obscure and inexplicable purposes, and turning the whole world over with blood and tears to a strange Witches' Sabbath."

The following documents will be published in coming issues of the International Relations Section of The Nation:

Secret Documents from the Hungarian Legation at Vienna.

Documents on the British Coal Crisis.

The South-African Native Affairs Bill—Labor in East Africa.

Housing Conditions in Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED